THE INDIAN MUSLIMS

A DOCUMENTARY RECORD

PROF. SHAN MUHAMMAD

Islamic Book Centre

H. O. 25, B, Masson Road
P.O. Box, 1625

Sales. 26, Paisa Akhbar.
Anarkali,

LAHORE

ALLIED BOOKS

★ The Aligarh Movement
(1864—1898)
3 VOLS.

★ Successors of
SIR SYED AHMED KHAN

★ UN-PUBLISHED LETTERS
OF ALI BROTHERS

THE INDIAN MUSLIMS

A Documentary Record of Muslim Struggle for Independence

(1900—1947)

VOLUME VII

KHILAFAT MOVEMENT (ii)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The peace terms offered to Turkey amazed Muslim India. It was a negation of the Prime Minister's pledge of January 5, 1918. It disregarded the feelings of Muslims all over the world. There was no comparison between the terms imposed on Axis powers like Germany, Austria and Bulgaria and those offered to Turkey. In spite of the promise that all the defeated powers either Christian or Muslim, would be treated alike, double standards were followed. Turkey was reduced to non-entity and the principle of self-determination for which war was fought was no longer kept in view. The All-India Muslim League soon reacted to it and declared that if the peace terms were persisted in, Muslim India, as a body, would dissociate itself from its loyal policy resulting into the most serious consequences. Under the auspices of the Khilafat Committee on June 1 and 2, 1920, the Hindus and Muslims reaffirmed their faith and promised to support whole-heartedly the Non-Cooperation movement of Gandhiji. The meeting recorded its emphatic protest against the Turkish peace terms and its unequivocal refusal to accept them as they were in direct contravention to the laws of Shariat and in flagrant violation of the pledges made by the British Government. The Committee intensified its activities and organised the khilafat volunteer corps with its branches all over India to apprise the masses of the effects of the British policy towards Turkey and the implications of the Non-Cooperation movement. The movement gained immense popularity and every arm bore the badge prescribed by the Khilafat Committee which read : 'We are the helpers of God.' The Committee also informed the Viceroy about its decision of withdrawing its cooperation from the Government as it considered loyalty to an earthly sovereign to be subservient to the loyalty of Islam which enjoins upon every Mussulman to consider those who wantonly injure the estates of the Khalifa to be the enemies of Islam and resist them with arms, if necessary. However the Committee discouraged 'resorting to arms' and assured the Viceroy of a non-violent movement in four progressive stages to enable it to control and discipline the popular feelings. A manifesto signed by Gandhiji, Azad, Shaukat Ali, Mohammad Ali, Hasrat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew and Ahmad Haji Siddiq Khatri was issued by the Non-Cooperation Committee in July 1920 which highlighted its programme. August 1, 1920 was declared the day for the inauguration of the Non-Cooperation movement. On this day, the Committee advised the people of India to observe complete hartal, barring only people engaged in essential services. Prayers and fasting for inward strength and purification were to be undertaken and meetings were to be held all over the country wherein a resolution was to be read. The prescribed resolution said that the meeting held by the inhabitants of that particular locality recorded

its complete sympathy with the movement of the Central Khilafat Committee in order to secure revision of the Turkish Peace Terms, consistently with Muslim sentiments and Islamic law and approved the Non-Cooperation movement adopted by the Central Khilafat Committee to be continued till the Peace Terms were revised. This resolution further pressed the Imperial Government in the interest of the Empire to secure a just revision of the terms which had been universally condemned as unjust and were contrary to pledges made by the British ministers.

The movement was clearly distinguished from the civil disobedience. It was pointed that there were to be no processions. Speeches in the meetings were to be restrained. All police and other Government instructions were to be obeyed and no meeting was to be held if there were any prohibitory orders for it. Title holders, Honorary Magistrates, Justices of Peace, Members of the Legislative Councils were requested to surrender their titles and posts on that day. In a letter Gandhiji explained to the Viceroy and through him to the whole of the British Cabinet his conduct and approach regarding the Khilafat question. He justified the Muslim claim and the services of the Muslims in war leading to the Allied victory. Since the grave injustice was done to Turkey which had pained the Muslims therefore to support their cause he joined the Khilafat movement. In his own words : '... as a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussulman countrymen, I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial.' Alongwith this letter leading Muslims also wrote a joint letter to the Viceroy expressing that the Turkish Peace Treaty was a direct violation of their religious obligations. The letter requested the Viceroy that in view of his repeated declarations that he had pressed the Mussulman's point of view on the Imperial Government to secure Turkish Peace Terms in consonance with the pledges and their sentiments, he must, in case of failure to effect such revision make common cause with the people of India, thereby reassuring the Mussulmans that they retained Viceroy's active cooperation in the persecution of their claims to the extent of resigning from his office. If he would fail to join the Khilafat cause, they would withdraw their cooperation from the Government. The letter also said that the Muslims of India could resist the enemies of Islam with arms as well. But they would not resort to arms so long as other means were open to them and that they would take non-cooperation to cause the least dislocation of and embarrassment to Government. Conscious of the Muslim restlessness Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew issued *A Draft Programme* for them which appealed to them to join the Congress in large numbers to fight for Swaraj. To activise the movement the draft said that the office of the Central Khilafat Committee should be moved from Bombay to Delhi; Jamia Millia (founded at Aligarh) to be shifted to Delhi for the training of the political workers; establishment of a press and a library at Delhi and starting of Maktabs attached to all mosques; opening of the colleges of technology and sciences to encourage trade and industry and the introduction of Panchayats to

discourage litigation and facilitate the amicable settlement of disputes.

Day by day the movement was gaining momentum. Opening of the fresh indigenous schools and nationalising the existing ones was part of the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation movement. Therefore efforts were made to nationalise the Aligarh Muslim University which led to stubborn opposition and finally closing of the University. In response to Mahatma Gandhi and Ali Brothers Government schools and civil courts were boycotted and fresh schools and Panchayats founded. Perfect Hindu-Muslim unity was in sight. Cow-slaughter was abandoned and Ramlila processions were greeted by the Muslims. Similarly during Moharram Hindus distributed water and tea to the Muslims.

The year 1921 dawned with greater activity. Besides the Khilafat and Jamait-ul-Ulema conferences which passed resolutions in condemnation to the Government and in support of the Turkish cause, the Ulemas of all schools of thought gave a religious Fatwa known as the Muttafiqa Fatwa in total support of the Khilafat issue. Then finally came the Karachi conference of July 8, 1921, which declared army service for a Muslim as unalwful and threatened the Government to resort to civil disobedience leading to complete independence if it fought the Angora Government. The leading participants of the conference including Ali Brothers were charged with tempering the loyalty of the army and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment. Gandhiji called their arrest as a 'prelude to Swaraj' which would enable the nation to reach its cherished goal. Truly, their arrest could not weaken the movement. The Khilafat and the Jamiat-ul-Ulema were constantly pressing the Government to modify the Peace Terms and also appealed to the people to work hard to this end. The conferences also reminded the Muslims that it was their duty to struggle for Swaraj with untiring zeal and energy and that to suffer for it was their Islamic heritage.

The Government was conscious of the Hindu-Muslim unity and was busy in playing its own game of divide and rule. A small Moplah riot was extensively propagated to intensify communal frenzy. False reports of Muslim atrocities on Hindus and their forcible conversion to Islam were highlighted. The Khilafat and the Congress committees contradicted the false reports and sought permission of the Government to visit the disturbed areas. But they were not allowed and if by chance they happened to be there they found the Government reports false and motivated. Top-ranking leaders knew the tactics of the Government and made fervent appeals to both the communities for cordial relations. Maulana Azad addressing the Tenth Khilafat Conference held at Cocanada on December 27, 1923 described the history of Hindu-Muslim relations and said that since the advent of the British rule, it had done everything to keep them apart. It was only in 1920 after strenuous efforts that the desired Hindu-Muslim unity was achieved which was rankling into their bosom. The Maulana appealed to them to trust each other. Similarly from the platform of Jamiat-ul-Ulema Syed Hussain Ahmad also reiterated the same and told that as Islam required every Muslim

to do his utmost to overcome his enemy; the Hindu-Muslim entente could alone enable them to work for it. He emphasised that India was the motherland of the Muslims. Here they were to live and die and they must, therefore, work for Swaraj as zealously as any other community.

But the British diplomacy had done its job well. Much communal virus had been infused and this ultimately marred the Hindu-Muslim unity receding the prospects of winning the Swaraj early. The communal riots spread and posed a challenge to the leaders of both the communities which for sometime was irresistable.

While India was busy in a fight for the restoration of the former position of the Khalifa, Turkey saw another development in the rise of Mustafa Kamal Pasha who controlled the forces, dethroned the Caliph and established a Republic in Turkey. While Khilafat did not survive in its own country the Indian Muslims were desperately struggling to restore it.

to do his utmost, to overcome his enemy, the Hindu-Muslim entente could alone enable them to work for it. He emphasised that India was the mother-land of the Muslims. Here they were to live and die and they must, therefore, work for Swaraj as zealously as any other community.

But the British diplomacy had done its job well. Much communal virus had been infused and this ultimately marred the Hindu-Muslim unity receding the prospects of winning the Swaraj early. The communal riots spread and posed a challenge to the leaders of both the communities which for sometime was irresistable.

While India was busy in a fight for the restoration of the former position of the Khilafat, Turkey saw another development in the rise of Mustafa Kamal Pasha who controlled the forces, dethroned the Caliph and established a Republic in Turkey. While Khilafat did not survive in its own country the Indian Muslims were desperately struggling to restore it.

SECTION 10

THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT (Contd.)

1

TURKISH PEACE TERMS : GOVERNMENT OF INDIA COMMUNIQUE

The following are the principal conditions of the Peace Terms communicated by the Allies to Turkey :

1. The frontiers of Turkey will be as already demarcated and, where necessary, revised by a Boundary Commission to be created according to this delimitation. Turkey will include the Constantinople sector of Thrace and all the predominantly Turkish areas of Asia Minor.
2. The rights and title of the Turkish Government in Constantinople will not be affected, but the right to modify this provision is reserved in the event of the failure of Turkey faithfully to fulfil the Treaty.
3. A Commission of the Straits will have authority over all waters between the Mediterranean mouth of the Dardenelles and the Black Sea mouth of the Bosphorus, and of the waters within three miles of each of these mouths, also on the shores to such extent as may be necessary. The duty of the Commission will be to ensure freedom of navigation in these waters in peace and war.
4. A scheme of local self-government will be drafted for Kurdistan, including provision for the protection of Assyro-Chaldean and other minorities. The League of Nations will decide later whether Kurdistan should be granted independence of Turkey, if it be proved that separation is desired by the majority of the Kurdish people.
5. Certain portions of Smyrna are formed into a separate unity to be administered by Greece, the suzerainty of Turkey being continued for a period of years till the autonomous state of Smyrna decides its own destiny.
6. With the exception of the Constantinople sector, Eastern Thrace is ceded to Greece, provision being made for the local self-government of the town of Adrianople.
7. Certain portions of the Armenian district of Turkey are added to the existing Armenian Republic, the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in certain districts being referred to the arbitration of the President of the United States whose decision will be final thereon and on any stipulation regarding Armenian access to the sea.

8. Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine are provisionally recognized as independent states, subject to administrative advice and assistance from a mandatory power; until such time as they are able to stand alone, the mandate for Syria has been entrusted to France and those for Mesopotamia and Palestine to Britain; the mandate for Palestine will include provision for giving effect to the declaration of November 8, 1917 regarding the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people.
9. The Hedjaz is recognized as a free and independent state. The King of Hedjaz undertakes to assure free and easy access to Mecca and Medina to Muslim pilgrims of all countries.
10. Turkey relinquishes all rights and titles over Egypt, Sudan, and Cyprus.
11. Turkey recognizes the French Protectorate over Morocco and Tunis.
12. Turkey renounces her claims to certain islands in the Ægean.
13. The military, naval and air forces at the disposal of Turkey will consist of the following :
    (*i*) The Sultan's Bodyguard at Constantinople;
    (*ii*) A troop of Gendarmerie for the maintenance of internal order and security and the protection of minorities;
    (*iii*) Special elements for reinforcement of the Gendarmerie and eventual control of the frontiers.

    The bodyguard is limited to 700 and the Gendarmerie with special elements to 50,000.

    All warships interned in Turkish ports are declared to be finally surrendered.

    The Turkish Fleet is limited to 6 Torpedo boats and 7 sloops.

    No military or naval air forces or dirigibles are to be maintained.
14. Control will be maintained over the finances of Turkey until the discharge of her international obligations has been assured.
15. Freedom of navigation and transit is secured. The following ports are declared international ports, provision to be made for free zones in each—Alexandertta, Basrah, Batoum, Constantinople, Dedeagatch, Haifa, Haidar Pasha, Smyrna and Trebizond.

    In addition to above, there are numerous provisions regarding :
16. (*a*) League of Nations, (*b*) Protection of Minorities, (*c*) Restoration of Abandoned Property Rights, (*d*) Prisoners of War, (e) Graves of Allied Soldiers, (*f*) Punishment of War Criminals, (*g*) Economic Question and Concessions, (*h*) Labour Conventions, and (*i*) Antiquities, but it is not necessary to detail these in the present statement.

Source : Indian Annual Register 1921.

2

TURKISH PEACE AND NON-COOPERATION

Now that the Turkish peace terms have been definitely announced, the question that is uppermost in every one's mind is, what are the Mussulmans of India going to do ? We put the question in this particular form, because with due deference to the high authority of Mr. Gandhi, we are bound to say that we have not been able to discover any readiness on the part of non-Muslims substantially the same obligations as Muslims. That there is genuine, deep and all but universal neighbourly sympathy especially with the Hindus, even a casual observer cannot fail to see. There is even a readiness in many non-Muslim quarters to give this sympathy a practical form and render every assistance to the Mussulmans whether pecuniary or otherwise, in their effort to obtain a revision of the peace terms, so long as this effort is confined within limits that do not either transgress the bounds of law and propriety or infringe the allegiance which the people of India owe to the British Throne. But there are no visible signs of a widespread desire on the part of any section of the non-Muslim community to make a common cause with the Muslims in respect of any of the graver things of which we have been hearing during the last few months.

As regards the Mussulmans themselves, the position is admittedly different. We have been told that the question of the temporal power of the Khilafat is itself a religious question and we all know what religion is to a Mahommedan. Indeed, we have seen no disposition in any quarter, however, unfriendly, to question either the profoundity or the universality of the feeling of dissatisfaction and resentment which the peace terms have caused among Indian Mussulmans, or the existence of a widespread desire in them to do everything in their power to secure a revision of those terms. Of course the sense of this power varies, and there are, we believe, a very large number of Mussulmans who are anxious that the protest of their co-religionists should not go beyond the limits set by prudence. Still there is infinitely greater solidarity among Indian Mussulmans in this matter than there is or could possibly be as between Mussulmans and non-Mussulmans and any decision at which the leaders of the community may arrive is bound to affect for good or for evil, though not in the same manner or degree, the attitude of the general body of Mussulmans. What is this decision going to be ? Although the Khilafat Committee, which we believe is the ultimate authority in this matter, has so far had no opportunity of expressing its opinion on the basis of the actual terms, we have had three pronouncements of high authority which leave no doubt as to what this opinion is likely to be. The first of these is the letter of Mr. Amir Ali to the *Times* in which he 'soundly condemns the Turkish terms as involving a breach of Faith and ignoring the

considerations on which alone a durable peace in Asia can be based.' Mr. Amir Ali, besides being a Mussulman of moderate views, is a Privy Councillor and such language from such a man shows which way the wind blows. Secondly, we have a very significant message from Maulana Shaukat Ali in which, while deprecating hasty or violent action, on the ground that 'it will damage our just cause', he says : 'We must organise and start the non-co-operation movement, working strenously with Mahatma Gandhi and our other Hindu bretheren. This movement must be given a full and fair trial. If this fails, then Mussulmans will decide what to do.' Thirdly, we have a statement from Mr. Gandhi himself, in which the views already stated more than once, are reiterated with the directness, lucidity and force that are among the unfailing characteristics of Mr. Gandhi's utterances on public questions. 'There is no sacred character about the peace terms', says Mr. Gandhi, 'They are capable of being revised. The only question is whether Mahommedans can exercise full self-control and at the same time undergo a considerable amount of self-sacrifice. Any outbreak of violence will undoubtedly spoil what is a good cause. I am convinced that non-cooperation is the only effective remedy, both for avoiding violence and for healing the wound inflicted on Mahommedan India.' Apart from the insistence on non-co-operation as the only remedy, and on the absolute avoidance of violence as an essential condition of the success of that remedy, we have here, perhaps for the first time, a more or less definite recognition of the fact that the question is essentially, and not merely primarily, a Mussulman one, and that it is more than doubtful if other communities, however sympathetic, will be any party to the adoption of such drastic remedies as the second and third stages of the non-cooperation campaign, for instance.

But more significant than this is the difference between meaning and implication of Mr. Gandhi's statement and that of Maulana Shaukat Ali. Mr. Gandhi would not think of any other remedy than non-cooperation in any case, and is absolutely confident that this remedy alone would be efficacious. Maulana Shaukat Ali on the other hand, is thinking of non-co-operation as only the first step, it being left to the Mussulmans themselves to think of any other steps, if this fails. What these other steps are to be, we are not told but judging from the utterances of other Mussulman leaders, and of Mr. Shaukat Ali himself on other occasions, it is impossible to say that they will always be compatible with the allegiance of the people of India to the British Throne. Does Mr. Gandhi think that a programme so indeterminate and so wide is identical or even compatible with his own ? For our part, we have made no secret of our opinion that non-cooperation itself, especially in its last two stages, is far too drastic a remedy which has no likelihood of being universally applied, and which, if applied on a large scale, is bound to do more harm than good. But to say, as Maulana Shaukat Ali does in effect, that even non-cooperation is not the whole of the programme is to definitely part company with the non-Muslims who do not and cannot

believe in divided allegiance and for whom, in present conditions and unless there is a radical alteration in the British policy in India as recently declared, allegiance to the King-Emperor is a necessary element in allegiance to the Motherland.

Source : The Tribune, May 1920.

3

LETTER FROM SYED AMEER ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

The peace terms offered to Turkey, the text of which appeared in your issue of yesterday, fill me with amazement; amazement at the absolute negation of the Prime Minister's pledge of 5 January 1918, which served its purpose at the time; amazement at the contemptuous, not to say cynical, disregard of the feelings of a hundred millions of the Kings' subjects, and at utter ignoring of the juridical considerations on which alone the hope of a durable peace in Asia can be based; for the repercussion of these peace terms is not likely to be confined to the disintegrated and dismembered Ottoman Empire. There is no comparison between the terms imposed on Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria and those now 'offered' to Turkey. Even the arch-enemy fared better. The terms to Turkey are avowedly more than punitive; they show no intention of constituting an independent Turkey capable of existence within 'the homeland of the Turkish race'; she is in fact wiped out as an independent State, although her independence is a *sine qua non* to the maintenance of the Caliphate. It is too late now to refer to the lofty principle of self-determination for which we went to war. But surely it would be more consonant with justice, humanity, as well as policy, whilst amputating the limbs, to leave intact the trunk, so as to enable it to recover in time some elements of life. The peace terms to Turkey may gratify ecclesiastical hatred and lift the Pan-Islamic nightmare. But what of the ultimate consequences ?

Source : The Times, May 1920.

4

MUSLIM LEAGUE'S CABLE TO PRIME MINISTER

Council of All-India Muslim League indignantly protests against peace terms offered to Turkey as in its deliberate opinion they are not only grossly

unjust and intolerable in themselves and more vindictive than those imposed upon any other State lately warring with Allies but involved violation of solemn pledges of British Government particularly those made at the beginning of war, regarding holy places of Islam and later on regarding Thrace and Asia Minor and calculated to undermine Khilafat and destroy temporal power and prestige essential to it in flagrant disregard of repeated remonstrances based on requirements of religious faith and sentiments of millions of Muslim British subjects who have loyally carried out their duties to the Empire during the war.

The Council solemnly declares its conviction, that if the said terms are persisted in they will tend to perpetuate bitter feelings of the Khilafat and the sanctity of Jaziratul Arab and their holy places in accordance with the demands of their faith regarding which they must prefer their own convictions to the contrary inferences drawn by some from Muslim history and to the opinion attributed to the late Sir Syed whose heterodoxy in religion is well known in the Muslim world, and the Council considers it a solemn duty to warn government that religious zeal for the security of the said pious objects is likely to drive large bodies of Muslims to desperate actions resulting in the most serious consequences deplorable no less to the Government than to themselves but still in the power of the British Cabinet to avoid.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

5

SYED HUSAIN, MEMBER OF THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION ON 'THE PEACE TREATY WITH TURKEY'

The Turkish Treaty, long waited for, was at least handed to the Turkish Delegation on behalf of the Allies on Tuesday last. Speaking from the Muslim point of view, the event is one to be welcomed if only because it serves to put an end to the agony of suspense and speculation under which the Muslim world has laboured for very many months past. The nature of the Treaty, moreover, is such that it must definitely clear the air by removing all possible doubt or misunderstanding in regard to the real intentions and motives of the Great Powers not only towards the future of the Ottoman Empire, but also the world of Islam at large.

Friends of France—and France has innumerable friends and admirers among all the Islamic peoples as well as in India—cannot but deplore that the singularly thankless and graceless task of handing over one of the most

amazingly unrighteous documents in all history should have been undertaken by a French Prime Minister, and it is not less deplorable that Mr. Millerand should have entered into the spirit of the transaction with such zest as to have addressed certain observations to the plenipotentiaries of the Ottoman Empire which will take rank among the masterpieces of diplomatic cynicism of all time. Referring to the decision of the Allied Powers to maintain the so-called sovereignty of the Sultan at Constantinople, M. Millerand said, 'This decision emphasises their desire to conclude with the Ottoman Empire a just Treaty which takes into account the legitimate rights, interests and aspirations of Turkey—a peace based on the principles of right, liberty and justice for the victory of which the Allies fought.'

It is only necessary to refer to the provisions of the Treaty to discover the incredible cant and monstrous perversion of language of which M. Millerand has been guilty. The provisions of the document which was handed to the Turkish Delegates on behalf of the Great Powers constitute in fact the negation of justice alike in a national and international sense, as well as of the 'legitimate rights, interests and aspirations' not only of Turkey, but of the Muslim world. If the Treaty is really based on the principles to which M. Millerand referred, then the meaning of such historic terms as 'right', 'liberty' and 'justice' will have to be fundamentally revised. The world may as well be invited henceforth to take black as white without envincing any particular surprise at the implied creation of the new synonymist.

It is not necessary for me to discuss the general character of the Treaty beyond saying that no more ruthless and cynical instrument could have been devised for the emasculation of a once great empire, the deliberate degradation of its people, and the unbridled exploitation of its territories. I shall content myself by referring to those aspects of the Treaty which have a direct bearing on the future of the Khilafat.

The Delegation of which I am a member was sent to Europe by the people of India, who include 70 millions of Mussulmans, charged to lay before the Governments and peoples of the Allied Powers the religious obligations of the Muslims and the national sentiment of India in respect of the settlement of peace with Turkey, and we formally represented our case in due course to the British Office, so that there could be no pretence of ignorance or possibility of misunderstanding either in London or in Paris regarding what the Muslim position is. We intimated, in accordance with our mandate, to the British and French Governments that a strong and independent Khalifa was indispensable to the religious, cultural, and political existence of Islam, and consequently the Muslim world could never acquiesce in any dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The great power have honoured the binding religious obligations of their millions of Muslim nationals—Great Britain has roughly 100 million Muslims with her empire and France about 35 millions—by attempting to reduce their spiritual head to the position of an ignominious figurehead, whom moreover, it is sought to consign to eternal

importance together with the permanent coercion into abject servitude and stagnation of the great and brave nation to which he belongs. Again, the Mussulmans of India asked, not only in their own behalf but in the name of all their co-religionists of whatever sect or clime, that the Holy Land of Islam should remain inviolate as heretofore. We submitted both to the British and French Governments that according to the law of Islam, Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem must remain in the direct custody of the Khalifa, and that no form of non-Muslim control could possibly be tolerated by Muslims over the area known as 'Jazirat-ul-Arab'. These are requirements which form an integral part of the practice and obligations of the Islamic faith, and in respect of which there is no earthly possibility of any compromise or surrender so far as the Muslim peoples are concerned. The great powers, represented and propelled by the combined wisdom of the 'Big Three', have again honoured the solemn religious obligations of one-fifth of mankind by seeking to compel the Khalifa to abdicate his own inalienable wardenship of the Holy Places in favour of the King of the Hejaz, and by conveniently bequeathing to one another mandates for Syria and Mesopotamia – which amounts, as the Muslims view it, to the inauguration for all practical purposes of Christian domination over the Holy Land of Islam. All these unconscionable proposals constitute a new world-problem of incalculable gravity and extensive ramifications, and irrespective of what attitude the Turkish Government may choose to adopt towards them, it is only right that the French public should realise that the Muslim conscience can never become reconciled to them.

For the rest, I may give only one example of the manner in which the solemn pledges of Allied statesmen to their own people have been observed in the actual drawing up of the treaty. On 5 January 1918, Mr. Lloyd George, claiming to speak in the name of the whole Empire, made a categorical declaration which for the last two years has been regarded by the people of India as a binding promise to which the honour of England was pledged. The British Prime Minister said : 'Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race.' Turning to the Treaty, one finds this solemn promise fulfilled by the transfer of the whole of Thrace, with the exception of a small strip around Chatalja, to Greece, together with the virtual transfer of other extensive territories of the Ottoman Empire, no less 'predominantly' Turkish in race and Muslim by religion, to Greek sovereignty —that same Greeks whose atrocities upon Muslims on the occasion of their occupation of Smyrna may be found fully recorded in the report of the Inter-Allied Commission, which, however, the British Government attempted to suppress. This sort of arrangement is 'peace-making' with a vengeance. Fortunately, there can be little doubt that there is not the slightest possibility of the Allied proposals commending themselves to the acceptance either of the Muslim world or of the vast majority of the peoples, as distinct from the Governments, of the European nations.

This Treaty will fall by the weight of its own rapacious injustice, but it is necessary that it should also be formally repudiated by all decent-minded and right-thinking people, irrespective of race or religion, interested in the welfare of humanity and the future peace of the world.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, May 1920.

6

MESSAGE FROM THE VICEROY TO THE MUSLIMS OF INDIA

15 May 1920

To day the decisions of the Supreme Council of the Allies in respect of peace settlement with Turkey have been made known to the world. They have been reached after the most careful and anxious consideration of representations from the Muslims of all countries and you have my assurance that before coming to its present decisions the Supreme Council has had all possible regard to those representations which have proceeded from the Muslim subjects of His Majesty in India. My Government are issuing along with a summary of the Peace Terms a statement which explains the principal decisions and the reasons for them. These decisions are in full accordance with the high principles which have been applied in the peace settlement with all other Powers lately at war with Britain and her Allies. Nevertheless they include terms which I fear must be painful to all Muslims. The long delays which have protracted your anxiety for over a year, although they have been unavoidable, have filled me with regret for your sake; and now in your hour of trial I desire to send you a message of encouragement and sympathy which I trust will uphold you. In the day of the Empire's need you made a splendid response to the call of your King and Country and by so doing you contributed much to the triumph of those ideals of justice and humanity for which the Allies fought. The Empire of which you form a part is now firmly established on these ideals; and a great future of political progress and material prosperity is within the grasp of the Muslims of India who have ever enjoyed under British Rule the fullest religious freedom. Before the late disastrous war Great Britain had always maintained the closest ties of friendship with Turkey, and I am confident that with the conclusion of this new Treaty that friendship will quickly take life again and a Turkey regenerate, full of hope and strength, will stand fourth, in the future as in the past, a pillar of the Islamic faith. This though will, I trust, strenghthen you to accept the Peace Terms with resignation, courage, and fortitude and to keep your loyalty towards the crown bright and untarnished as it has been for so many generations.

2. However much they may regret some of these decisions Indian Muslims must feel satisfaction in knowing that the settlement has been greatly influenced by their representation. When replying to the Khilafat deputation on the 29th January last, His Excellency the Viceroy gave an account of steps which had been taken by the Secretary of State and himself from the date of the armistice onwards to represent to His Majesty's Government the views of Indian Muslims, especially with regard to the holy places in the Hedjaz and the future of Constantinople, and to secure that their representations should receive a full hearing from the Supreme Council of the Allies. After that date the representatives of the All-India Khilafat Conference were given every facility and assistance by the Government of India to lay their case before the Prime Minister and the strength of Indian Muslim feeling in the matter has been impressed upon His Majesty's Government in frequent communications made to the Secretary of State. The Prime Minister replying to the Khilafat Deputation assured the Mahommedans of India that their case had been presented with great force and had been examined with conscientious care not merely by the delegates of the British Empire, but also by the Supreme Council of the Allies. And in fact the representations made by Indian Mahommedans did materially influence the final decision. It is well known that there was a great and strong body of public opinion both in England and America which favoured the removal of the Turkish capital from Constantinople to Asia Minor, and that such counsels did not prevail is in no small measure due to the knowledge how keenly Indian Moslem opinion was opposed to the step. Indian Moslems have therefore the satisfaction of knowing that largely out of deference to their feelings and the representations of the Government of India, Constantinople was saved for the Turkish Empire as its capital.

3. The Governor General in Council would next like to advert to the allegation which is sometimes made that British policy has ever been in the past unfriendly to Turkey. For this statement there is no foundation. It is unnecessary to refer to the ancient friendship between the two countries proved by the entry of Britain on the side of Turkey in the Crimean war and by all her subsequent efforts to preserve integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The forbearance which Britain displayed and the provocation which Turkey under the domination of German influences and the leadership of the Committee of Union and Progress gave before war was declared, were fully explained in the communique issued by the Government of India in October 1914. It was Turkey which broke the traditional friendship with Great Britain. In his reply to the Khilafat Deputation the Prime Minister made it absolutely clear that Britain had no understanding of any sort of kind with Russia to the detriment of Turkey when the war began. In fact Britain sought to deter Turkey from entering the war by giving her the most complete assurance that if she maintained neutrality, Britain would see that at the conclusion of peace no conditions would be laid down which would impair

her independence and integrity, and that economic conditions of a character favourable to Turkey would be obtained. In spite of all these assurances Turkey took the fatal step of entering the war on the side of Germany, and against her ancient Ally.

4. It is most important that there should be no misunderstanding as to the attitude of Government towards the question of the Khilafat. The Government of India repeat again that the question of the Khilafat is one for Mahommedans, and Mahommedans only to decide, and that with their free choice in this matter, Government have no desire to interfere. But they cannot acquiesce in the statement which is now made that the Khilafat of the Ottoman Sultan has remained unchanged in its temporal attributes for thirteen centuries or that it implies any temporal allegiance on the part of Indian Muslims. These are propositions which are contrary to history. The temporal power associated with the Khilafat has undergone the most violent frictions during the last thirteen centuries. It has covered the whole of the dominions embraced in the Saracenic Empire when that was in the fullness of its glory. On the other hand it was reduced to nothing for over two centuries when the Khalifa was the mere spiritual Head of Islam under the Mameluk dynasty of Egypt. With the transference of the Khilafat to the Ottoman dynasty, the temporal power of the Khalifa has waxed and waned with the extent of the Ottoman Empire, but the essence of the Khilafat remained unaltered and cannot now be affected by any present change in the boundaries of that Empire. Nor, also, so far as Indian Muslims are concerned, is there any historical basis for the claim that the Khilafat implies any temporal allegiance on their part to the Sultan of Turkey. Any such theory of divided allegiance would be suversive of the constitutional basis on which all Government rest.

5. It is also a mistake to suppose that the war was a religious one or that the terms of peace have been influenced in any way by religious considerations. The Muslims of India recognized this first proposition very clearly five years ago. The war was one between Christian powers, and the alliance of Turkey with a Christian power places this beyond doubt. As to the second, the peace conference has applied the same principles to all autocratic empires, Muslim and Christian alike. The Empire of Austria-Hungary has lost over two-thirds of its dominions and three-fourth of its population. Heavy as Turkey's losses are, they fall far short of these. And although it is true that Turkish sovereignty has been confined to areas within which Turks predominate, Indian Mahommedans must remember that the independence of their Arab co-religionists remains intact throughout a very large proportion of the remainder of the former Ottoman Empire and that the only areas which have been removed entirely from Muslim control are the comparatively small areas of Armenia, Thrace and Smyrna, in each of which according to pre-war statistics the population was predominantly non-Muslim.

6. Again it has been said that the settlement is a breach of the promise or offer made by the Prime Minister in his speech of January 1918 when he

said : 'Nor are we fighting to destroy Austria-Hungary or to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race.' This passage must however be read with its context, for Mr. Lloyd George continued, 'While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople—the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea being internationalized and neutralized—Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine are, in our judgment, entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions.'

The peace terms now published fulfil this offer or promise, for her homelands which are predominantly Turkish in race have been left to Turkey and those portions of Thrace and Smyrna which have been separated have been treated in accordance with principle of nationality. This is a principle which has been followed in all the other Treaties of peace. The Supreme Council decided that the Turks had forfeited their title to rule over the majorities of other races and that these majorities should be joined to their own national states. Both in Thrace and in Smyrna the Muslim population before the war was in a minority. In 1914 and 1915 the Turkish Government carried out a systematic depor tation of the non-Muslim population from these areas and the statistics of to-day cannot therefore be made a reason for retaining them under Turkish rule. In Thrace the sector of Constantinople where Turks predominate has been conserved to Turkey. The rest of Thrace was predominantly Greek in 1912 and has therefore been united with Greece. There is no doubt that Adrianople is predominantly Turkish, but it is only an island of Turks separated from the Constantinople sector by a region predominantly Greek. It is impossible to separate an island such as this from the territories by which they are surrounded, and therefore in accordance with the universal practice of the Peace Council in the rest of Europe, it has been treated as part of the Thrace subject to an arrangement which ensures a system of local self-government and guarantees proper representation is the Turkish majority in Adrianople. Similarly in Smyrna the majority of the people are definitely Greek and Armenian but the area transferred has been cut down to the minimum suitable for separate administration. The suzerainty remains with Turkey and the districts concerned will eventually decide their own destiny by vote. The port ofSmyrna will be free. Turkey will have freedom of transit and there will be a separate department for the Turkish minority.

7. It is unnecessary to refer at length to the reasons which have led the Allies to insist upon the internationalization and neutralization of the Straits between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Its opening to Germany and its closure against the British in 1914 had disastrous effects in prolonging the great war with all its bloodshed and misery. This great waterway of the world must remain in future open to the free commerce of all nations.

8. The maintenance of some control over the finances of Turkey to safeguard international obligation is no new proposal as for years such control

has been exercised for the administration of the Ottoman debt. This necessity has become all the greater now that the debt has increased from 160 millions to nearly five hundred millions, while Turkish territory has decreased. The new states formed out of Turkey have a consultative voice in the Financial Commission and for termination of the Commission when her obligations have been discharged.

9. The provisions regarding the Army and navy of Turkey require little comment. The reduction of the Turkish army is in accordance with the arrangements which have been made for the general disarmament of the other power lately at war with the Allies. Turkey had no effective navy before the war and this condition is maintained.

10. Of more interest to Muslims in India are those provisions which concern the portions of the former Turkish Empire where their Arab co-religionists preponderate. The absolute independence of Arabia is recognised. For generations the Arabs have suffered from the misrule of Turks and it is unreasonable to ask that the Arab populations which have claimed independence off Turkey and have fought side by side with the Allies to secure their independence should be replaced by the Allies under Turkish rule. As the Prime Minister pointed out to the Khilafat Deputation, it would be unjust to deprive the Arabs of their independence merely because they are Mahommedans and co-religionists of the Turkey. 'We are applying', he said, 'exactly the same principles in Christian places, and to impose the dominion of the Sultan upon Arabia, which has no desire for it, is to impose upon Arabs something which we certainly would not dream of imposing upon Christian communities'.

11. Similar considerations apply to Kurdistan of which the right to local autonomy is provisionally recognized, and to those areas in Asia, over which mandates have been entrusted by the Peace Conference to Britain and France, that is to say, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Syria. It cannot be too clearly understood that in all these three cases the mandates have been granted for a specific purpose and for a temporary period. The immediate application to these areas of the principle of nationality would spell chaos and anarchy : and the work of the mandatory powers is to assist the local inhabitants with administrative advice and help, until such time as they are fit to take over with success the business of administration without outside assistance. Islam will not be weakened by these arrangements and the two great Powers, to whom these mandates have been confided, include within the limits of their empires a very large proportion of the total Muslim population of the world—a guarantee that interests and rights of the Muslims of those areas will be fully respected.

12. In the countries of Arabia, Iraq and Palestine are situated the holy places of Islam with which all Muslims are profoundly concerned. When the war began the Allies gave a solemn pledge that the holy places would remain inviolate. This pledge has been observed in the spirit and in the letter during

the actual occupation by His Majesty's forces of the territories in which some of the holy places are situated and steps have been taken to ensure their strict sanctity. The city of Jerusalem was not attacked as has been stated, but surrendered without violence offered or attempted, after it had been isolated in the course of operations against enemies armed in the field. The fullest measures were straightway taken to preserve the sanctity of the holy places within it, and the city which is in itself as sacred to Christians as to Muslim custodians. In Mesopotamia the holy places of Kerbala and Najaf were never attacked and no acts of war were committed there by our troops. The scrupulous forbearance of His Majesty's soldiers was gratefully acknowledged by the inhabitants themselves. The unopposed occupation of Baghdad as of Jerusalem involved no attack on the Holy Places, but was an inevitable incident in the field operations of the war. The shrines in these three sacred places of Mesopotamia are now in the custody of a distinguished Muslim whose charge of them is an ample assurance that their sanctity will continue to be fully respected. The British forces have conducted no operations whatever in the Hedjaz and any reports that Mecca or Medina has been entered by British troops are utterly without foundation. These places are entirely under Arab control.

13. There remain the case of certain Armenian districts whose incorporation in the adjoining Armenian Republic is a direct consequences of Turkish misrule and of the application to this area of the principle of nationality. The cruelties perpetrated on the Armenians in the shape of massacre and deportation admit of no doubt. The story has been proved by independent and reliable witnesses and it is established beyond dispute that during the year 1915 at least 60,00,000 Armenians were destroyed. The facts were indeed admitted by the Turkish emissaries in Paris who represented the Turkish Government and their sole excuse was that the Committee of Union and Progress who were in power at the time were responsible for the massacres.

14. In these explanations of the Turkish Peace terms, the Governor General in Council does not speak for His Majesty's Government. He has utilized such information as has come into his possession, and has attempted to explain the terms with special reference to their bearing on Indian Muslim sentiments. He has stated all the facts, nothing being mitigated and nothing overstated. He recognises that in spite of all explanations the terms of the peace settlement with Turkey are such as must cause pain to the Mahommedans of India. Indian Muslims must brace themselves to bear with patience and resignation the misfortunes of their Turkish co-religionists. The situation is one which calls for clear vision and a resolve to build a better future on the wreck of the past. Above all, the world needs peace and goodwill. It is a matter of supreme necessity for all men to work towards this end and those who at this critical time arouse religious passions are enemies not only of India but of Mankind.

Source: The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

7

RESOLUTION OF THE A. I. CENTRAL KHILAFAT COMMITTEE ON ALLIED PEACE TERMS

Allahabad, 1-2 June 1920

This meeting reaffirms the movement of non-cooperation in accordance with the 4 stages already approved by the Central Khilafat Committee and appoints a sub-committee consisting of the following gentlemen with power to add to their number to give practical effect to the movement with further delay. Mahatma Gandhi, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Maulvi Mohamad Ali, Mr. Ahmed Haji Siddick Khatri, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Dr. Kitchlew and Maulana Mohani.

This meeting of the All India Central Khilafat Committee records its emphatic protest against the Turkish peace terms, and its unequivocal refusal to accept them as they are in direct contravention to the laws of Shariat and in flagrant 'violation' of the pledges made by the responsible minister and officers of the British Crown. It further declares that any terms which do not completely satisfy the requirements of the sacred Islamic laws and the irreducible minimum repeatedly stated by the Central Khilafat Committee would not satisfy the Muslims of India. The meeting therefore urges that in the interest of the peace and contentment of the people of India the peace terms should be revised in conformity with those pledges and Islamic demands.

This meeting begs leave to invite the attention of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad to a *Farman* recently issued by His Exalted Highness prohibiting Khilafat meetings to be held within the Dominions of Hyderabad State, and places before His Exalted Highness the opinion of the Ulemas that this prohibition is opposed to the laws of Shariat and therefore deserves reconsideration.

This meeting resolves that the Swadeshi movement should be undertaken in right earnest and a sub-committee consisting of the following gentlemen be appointed to work out a scheme for carring out the movement : Mr. Chotani, Mahatma Gandhi, Maulana Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew, Maulvi Zafar Ali Khan, Agha Safdar Saiyed Abdurrauf, Mohamed Yusuf Sharif, Mr. Tajuddin, Musih-ul-mulk Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Lala Shankarlal, Maulana Shassoleman, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Messrs Umar Sobani, Ahmed Haji Siddick Khatri, Abdul Wadood, Zahoor Ahmed, Dr. Noor Mohamed, Sheikh Abdul Majid Maulana Abul Kalam, Maulvi Akmin Khan Azad, Maulvi Munirazzaman, Mr. Yakub Hasan.

This meeting places on record its deep sense of obligation to Lala Amer Chand of Peshawar who has carefully submitted to internment and persecution as a penalty for his large-hearted sympathy with the Khilafat movement and

congratulates him upon his heroic self-sacrifice and assures him of every support.

That this meeting wishes to record its grateful appreciation of the true Islamic fortitude and courage displayed by Maulana Fakhir and Hamid Ahmad under most provocating and oppressive circumstances and prefering to go to jail rather than submit to orders on government to refrain from carrying out Khilafat propaganda.

This meeting resolves that a Khilafat volunteer corps be organized and its branches be established all over India so that they may collect subscriptions for the Khilafat fund on Jumatulwida, and afterwards and also prepare the Indian public for the non-cooperation movement.

The meeting resolves that all Muslims and supporters of Khilafat should use a badge on which the following words should be engraved. 'We are helpers of God.'

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1921.**

8

THE COMMUNIQUE ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ON THE ACTIVITIES OF ALI BROTHERS

8 June 1920

In April 1919, the Government of India received definite information that the brothers Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali were taking active measures to stir up ill-will against the government. While the question of taking steps prevent these activities were under consideration, a memorial from the brothers was received by His Excellency the Viceroy. In this memorial they expressed themselves intemperately and inaccurately about the attitude of the British Government to Muslim questions, and stated that in the event of non-compliance with their demands, there remained no choice for a good Muslim in India except between *Hijrat* (migration) and *Jehad* (Holy war). This document was proscribed by the Government of India, but surreptitious attempts were nevertheless made to print and circulate it among the leading Muslims in India and to publish it in the Press. It is to the credit of the Press of India that no newspaper gave it publicity. Soon after the receipt of this memorial the Government of India learned that the brothers had sent a letter to the Deputy Commissioner, Chhindwara, apprising him that they would not regard themselves as bound by the orders of internment after the 9 May

1919. The brothers further publicly announced in the mosque their intention of disobeying those orders, and also read out parts of their memorial to the Viceroy. Since the opening of the Frontier campaign indisputable proofs have reached the Government of India that the brothers are making every effort to induce Muslims in India actively to assist the Amir of Afghanistan in his hostilities against His Majesty the King-Emperor. They have with this object addressed various important personages in India, as well as newspapers and private individuals. The originals of some of these letters are in the possession of the Government of India. Recently, on the 30 May, Mohamed Ali made a speech at the mosque, in which he abused certain leading Muslims for condemning the action of the Amir of Afghanistan and asserted that no Muslim could, without detriment to his soul, take part in war against Afghanistan. He declared that it was the duty of a Mussulman not to fight against his brother when he is fighting for Islam. To sum up, the Government of India have had ample evidence that the brothers are pursuing an active campaign against the British Government and have openly advocated assistance to the King's enemies. They are also satisfied that the restrictions now imposed upon the brothers under the Defence of India Act are not sufficient to prevent them from inciting loyal Muslims to abandon their attitude of loyalty, of which they have given so many proofs in the past. In order, therefore, effectively to stop their disloyal propaganda the Governor General-in-Council has decided to issue orders for their detention in jail under Regulation III of 1818.

Source : The Pioneer, July 1920.

9

THE KHILAFAT MESSAGE TO THE VICEROY

In pursuance of the decision arrived at the special meeting of the Central Khilafat Committee the following letter signed by about 90 Mussulmans from various parts of India including Messrs. Yakoob Hasan, Mazhar-ul-Haq, Maulana Abdul Bari, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew, Mr. Mohammed Chotani and Mr. Shaukat Ali, was sent to H. E. the Viceroy.

Your Excellency ! We, the undersigned, claim to represent the largest body of Sunni Muslim opinion. We have most carefully read the Turkish peace terms and we consider them to be in direct violation of the religious sentiments of Mussulmans. They are contrary to the pledges of British Ministers on the strength of which it has been admitted it was possible to draw upon India

for Muslim recruits during the war. We hold the British Empire which is the greatest Mahommedan power in the world cannot treat the Turkish Empire which represents the Khilafat in the same manner that it may treat a defeated enemy. Indeed, we contend in certain respects that Turkey had been treated worse than other powers. We respectfully submit that in the treatment of Turkey, the British Government are bound to respect the Indian Muslim sentiment in so far as it is neither unjust nor unreasonable.

In our opinion the position taken up by the Indian Mussulmans is simple. They cannot bear the thought of the temporal power of the Sultan being adversely affected by way of punishment for his having joined Germany under circumstances which need not be examined here, but we have no desire to ask for anything that would interfere with the principle of self-determination. We have no desire to uphold any misrule such as has been attributed to Turkey. Our Delegates in Europe have asked for an independent commission of enquiry to investigate the charge of wanton cruelty said to have been practised by Turkish soldiers in Armenia. We cannot look with indifference upon the partition of Turkey and her Empire for the sake of punishing or humiliating her.

We would therefore request Your Excellency and your Government to ask His Majesty's Ministers to secure a revision of the peace terms and tell them that on the failure to do so, Your Excellency will make common cause with the people of India. We make this suggestion as Your Excellency has repeatedly declared that your government had consistently and often pressed upon the attention of His Majesty's Ministers the case of Indian Mussulmans in this matter of vital concern to the vast majority of them. We feel, therefore, we have a right to ask Your Excellency to reassure the Mussulmans of India that they still retain your active co-operation and powerful advocacy in the prosecution of their claims even to the point of the resignation of your high office, should His Majesty's Ministers fail to secure a revision of the terms consistent with the pledges and sentiments mentioned above. We venture respectfully to suggest that had India been a dominion enjoying full self-government, her responsible ministers would have as a matter of course resigned as a protest against such serious breach of pledges and flouting of religious opinion as are involved in the peace terms.

If, unfortunately, Your Excellency will not adopt our humble suggestion we shall be obliged, as from the 1 August next, to withdraw co-operation from the government and to ask our co-religionists and Hindu brethern to do likewise. We ask Your Excellency not to regard our statement as a threat or in any way as a mark of disrespect. We claim to be as loyal subjects of the Crown as any in India, but we consider our loyalty to the earthly sovereign to be subservient to our loyalty to Islam. The latter enjoins upon every Mussulman to consider those who wantonly injure the estates of the Khilafat to be the enemies of Islam and to resist them with arms, if necessary. We recognise that even if we had power we must not resort to arms so long as

any other means are at our disposal. We feel that the least a Mussulman can do in these circumstances is not to assist those who are guilty of trying to reduce the Khilafat practically to nothingness. It would, therefore, become our painful duty to refuse to co-operate with the Government which accepts the peace terms and advises the acceptance thereof by us.

We shall hope that such serious step as non-cooperation will not become necessary, but should it unfortunately happen to be otherwise, we assure Your Excellency we shall strive our utmost to avoid violence. We fully recognise our responsibility. We know any eruption of violence must check and injure the peaceful demonstration contemplated by us, and what is more the sacred cause which is dear to us as life. We shall therefore take up non-cooperation in progressive stages and so as to cause the least necessary dislocation or embarrassment to the Government and so as to enable us to control and discipline the popular feeling.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

10

NOTE OF THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION ON TURKISH TREATY SENT TO LLOYD GEORGE, THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

10 July 1920

On March 19 last, in the course of their interview with you, the Indian Khilafat Delegation had the honour to submit for your consideration and that of His Majesty's Government, the views and sentiments of the Indian people in regard to the future of the Khilafat and the proposed settlement of peace with Turkey. We took occasion, in accordance with our mandate, to lay before you fully the binding religious obligations of Mussulmans with regard to the preservation of the Khilafat and cognate question which, as we submitted, should be respected in any proposals which His Majesty's Government and their Allies might formulate for concluding a lasting peace with the Government of His Majesty the Sultan, the Khalifa of Islam.

Among other things, we hope we made it very clear that the two fundamental requirements of the Muslim Faith in this matter are the preservation of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Empire of the Khalifa and the inviolability of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the Holy Land of Islam. We indicated that, while our people were not oppsed to such political

changes, in accordance with the understanding on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was concluded, as would guarantee autonomous government to the non-Turkish nationalities within the Ottoman Empire, without prejudice to the status and dignity of Turkey as a Sovereign Power, the fabric of the Ottoman Empire itself, the dismemberment of which would involve the destruction of the Khilafat, should be maintained intact.

From the reply that you made to the Delegation, it was clear that you were out of sympathy with the view-point of Mussulmans, and of the people of India generally, which the Delegation had put before you, and that you were out of accord with the suggestions and proposals that we had submitted. There were also statements of facts in your reply to which the Delegation demurred, and on which we would have been glad to join issue with you had occasion been offered. But as the conditions of the interview did not permit of this, the Delegation have since called into question, in the public Press and otherwise, such of your statements as did not appear to be well-founded. We have also been in correspondence with your Private Secretary, with a view to obtain the necessary confirmation of the authenticity of the figures of population, etc., on which you appeared to rely in the observations you made to the Delegation. But so far our efforts have led to no satisfactory results, and the information repeatedly applied for has not been forthcoming.

Since you granted the interview to the Delegation, the text of the proposed Peace Treaty with Turkey has been handed to the Plenipotentiaries of the Turkish Government in Paris. Certain observations on the same have also been handed to the Allies by His Highness Damad Ferid Pasha, the Grand Vizier of Turkey, over his sole signature.

The Delegation have carefully examined both these documents, and feel it their duty to submit the following observations on the same for the consideration of His Majesty's Government and their Allies.

We need hardly emphasise at this stage that the Turkish Peace Settlement, vitally affecting as it does the entire future of the Khilafat and of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, is a question in which the Mussulmans of India are as deeply concerned as the Turks and the Arabs themselves. We may recall here that the Deputation that had waited upon the Viceroy at Delhi on January 19 last, with a view to ask for necessary arrangements being made for the Delegation to proceed to Europe and America, had in unmistakable language stated in the address it presented to His Excellency, that even if the Ottoman Turks could be made to acquiesce in a settlement such as has since been proposed, 'it would remain as unacceptable as ever to every believing Mussulman'.

After a careful examination of the provisions of the proposed Treaty of Peace with Turkey, the Delegation have no hesitation in declaring that it is one which in its implied intention and effect must directly violate the Muslim conscience. Moreover, we are convinced that it cannot fail to be equally repugnant to our non-Muslim compatriots in India as a whole, who, as you are aware, are identified wholeheartedly on this question with their Muslim

fellow countrymen for the reason already indicated, as well as on account of its general character, which is inequitable and harsh.

It is with profound regret that the Delegation observe that the considerations which they placed before you in the interview of March 9 last, including a statement of the solemn and indefensible religious obligations of Mussulmans in regard to the Khilafat and the Jazirat-ul-Arab, have been ignored and flouted in this Treaty. They cannot but deplore that His Majesty's Government should have set such little store by the rights of conscience and requirements of Faith of one hundred million loyal Muslim subjects of His Majesty as is evidenced by the Articles, and indeed the whole tenor, of the Treaty which was presented to the Turkish Plenipotentiaries on behalf of Great Britain and her Allies.

Irrespective of what the Turks may or may not do, the Delegation must point out that the Treaty under reference is, and must remain, unacceptable to those whom they have the honour to represent. The Mussulmans of India have no option but to declare their unhesitating and unconditional rejection of the present Treaty as it stands, and we beg leave to draw your attention and that of His Majesty's Government specifically to some of those Articles of it which run counter to and directly contravene the obligations and requirements of the Islamic Faith.

We would first cite Article 139 of the Treaty, which runs as follows:

'Turkey renounces formally all rights of suzerainty or jurisdiction of any kind over Muslims who are subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of any other State. No power shall be exercised directly or indirectly by any Turkish authority whatever in any Territory detached from Turkey or of which the existing status is recognised by Turkey under the present Treaty. It is obvious that Turkey has, and could have, no 'rights of suzerainty or jurisdiction' over Mussulmans who are not her subjects; but it is equally obvious that the Sultan of Turkey as Khalifa has, and must continue to have, so long as he holds that office, his very considerable 'jurisdiction' over Muslims who are 'subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of any other State.' The law of Islam clearly prescribed the character and extent of the 'jurisdiction' pertaining to the office of Khalifa, and we cannot but protest most emphatically against this indirect, but nonetheless palpable, attempt on the part of Great Britain and her Allies to force on the Khalifa a surrender of such 'jurisdiction', which must involve the abdication of the Khilafat. The proposal, we are constrained to say, constitutes a grave and intolerable encroachment on the fundamental religious canons of Islam. And, we may observe, it is all the more astonishing in view of the fact that His Majesty's Government have repeatedly declared that the question of the Khilafat was one for Mussulmans alone to deal with and decide.

Similarly, Article 121 of the Treaty which lays down that:

'Turkey definitely renounces all rights and privileges, which, under the Treaty of Lausanne of 12 October 1912, were left to the Sultan in Libya.'

infringes rights pertaining to the Sultan as Khalifa which had been specifically safeguarded and reserved under the said Treaty of Lausanne.

In the course of our interview with you on 19 March last, we had also formally intimated, in accordance with our instructions, that any form of non-Muslim control over the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the Holy Land of Islam, which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, was, according to Islamic Law, absolutely ruled out, and consequently non-Muslim domination of these regions, whether in the shape of 'mandates' or otherwise could never be acceptable to Mussulmans. This categorical and inalienable requirements of the Muslim Faith, supported as it is by the unbroken practice of over 1,300 years, is also, we find, totally disregarded by Article 94 to 97 of the Peace Treaty, read in conjunction with Articles 22 and 132.

The Prophet's death-bed injunction makes the Mussulmans themselves the mandatories in these sacred regions, and they have a right to expect from Great Britain and her Allies a clear recognition in the Treaty of 'the sacred character attributed by Muslims of all countries' and respect for the 'precepts of the law of the Quran' not only with regard to Mecca and Medina and the pious foundations established there, which is already embodied in Article 99, but with regard to entire area of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the sanctity of which is equally widely acknowledged and equally firmly based on similar religious precepts. To require the successor of the self-same Prophet who gave to the Mussulmans a mandate for these sacred regions, to accept the doctrine of other mandates for them in direct contravention of this, and in advance 'to accept any decision that may be taken' in relation to questions concerning these regions, to renounce 'in favour of the Principal Allied Powers all rights and titles which he could claim on any ground over or concerning these territories' and 'recognise and conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied Powers...in order to carry the above stipulation into effect', is an intolerable outrage not only on his conscience, but on the conscience of every Mussulman.

Apart from the above religious consideration, which after all, must be the governing consideration in this matter for all Mussulmans, the proposed mandates run counter to the doctrine of self-determination on which you seemed to lay so much emphasis in the course of the Delegation's interview with you. We may recall that on that occasion, when the Delegation suggested that Mussulmans could well be left to adjust the Arabs' claim to independence with the scheme of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafat, you had stated that 'the Arabs have claimed independence; they have proclaimed Feisul King of Syria; they have claimed that they should be severed from Turkish dominion; is it suggested that the Arabs should remain under Turkish dominion merely because they are Mahommedans'. We would take the liberty to remind you that if the Arabs, who are an overwhelmingly large majority in these regions, have claimed independence, they have clearly claimed it free from the incubus of so-called mandates, and their claim to be severed from

Turkish dominion is emphatically not a claim to be subjected to the 'advice and assistance' of mandatory of the principal Allied Powers. If the principle of self-determination is to be applied at all, it must be applied regardless of the wishes and interests of foreign Powers covetously seeking to exploit regions and peoples exposed to the danger of foreign domination on account of their unprotected character. The Arab Congresses have unequivocally declared that they want neither protectorates nor mandates, nor any other form of political or economic control; and the Delegation, while reiterating their views that an amicable adjustment of Arab and Turkish claims by the Muslims themselves in accordance with Islamic Law, is perfectly feasible, must support the Arab demand for complete freedom from the control of mandatories appointed by the Allies.

We must, however, make it clear once more, that our views are based on the eternal and immutable principles of Islam, and are held by us irrespective of the views that may be held at a particular time by the Arabs inhabiting these regions, which are not merely the home of the Arabs, but form the sacred trust and are common heritage of all Mussulmans.

With regard to Palestine in particular, the Delegation desire to state that Article 99, embodying the Declaration of the British Government of 2 November 1917, is extremely vague, and it is not clear in what relation the so-called national home for the Jewish people, which is proposed to be established in Palestine, would stand to the State proposed to be established there. The Mussulmans of the world are not ashamed of their dealings with their Jewish neighbours, and can challenge a comparison with others in this respect; and the Delegation in the course of the interview with you endeavoured to make it clear that there was every likelihood of all reasonable claims of Jews in search of a home being accepted by the Muslim Government of Palestine. But if the very small Jewish minority in Palestine is intended to exercise over the Muslims, who constitute four-fifths of the population, a dominance, now or in the future when its numbers have swelled after immigration, then the Delegation must categorically and emphatically oppose any such designs.

With regard to the Hedjaz, Article 98, which requires Turkey, not only to recognise it as a free and independent State, but to renounce all rights and titles there, and Article 99, which makes no mention of the rights and prerogatives of the Khalifa as Servant of the Holy Places, are, and must ever be equally unacceptable to the Muslim world. As the Delegation, in the course of their interview with you, have already emphasised, the Khalifa is the Servant of the Holy Places and must ever remain its Warden, and any attempt to alter his status or restrict his rights and prerogatives in the *harems* of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem would never be tolerated by the Mussulmans of the world.

Moreover, we would point out that Article 100 requires to be thoroughly elucidated. Is it intended, for instance, that 'the complete equality of treat-

ment' which is sought to be 'assured in the territory of the Hedjaz to persons... of nationals of any other of the Allied Powers' will abrogate the well-known and recognised practice 'in accordance with the precepts of the law of the Quran', of excluding non-Muslims from the prohibited areas. If so, any such encroachment must be opposed by all Mussulmans.

In the foregoing paragraphs, we have dealt with such Articles of the Draft Treaty as *directly* contravene the requirements of Islamic law. But no less unacceptable to us and to those whom we have the honour to represent are the numerous Articles that are calculated, singly or in their cumulative effect, to undermine the independence and the temporal power of the Khilafat, conditions which are indispensable to its continued existence as the most essential institution of Islam.

In your interview with the Delegation you had referred to the fierce controversy which had raged for over a generation as to the temporal power of the Roman Catholic Church, and to sincere, earnest and zealous Mussulmans who took a very different view of the temporal power of the Khilafat from the one which the Delegation was charged to explain to you, and you were disinclined to enter into a discussion 'where men of the same faith take a different view'. We are not aware to what school of 'sincere, earnest and zealous Mussulmans' you were referring, for although Islam, like other faiths, has a number of sects, we are not aware of any that does not consider the temporal power to be of the very essence of the Khilafat. The Government of India have already received long and detailed jurisdical declarations of the Ulema in India, which must, we imagine, preclude any misunderstanding on the subject, and no analogies from other creeds can serve any purpose save that of clouding and befogging the clearest of issues.

In full accordance with this clear statement, the Manifesto that the All-India Khilafat Conference issued last February in its Bombay session, which forms the mandate of the Delegation, declared that 'the claim regarding the Khilafat consists in leaving the Turkish Empire as it was at the time of the outbreak of the War, except that, although the allegations of Turkish misrule are not admitted, the non-Turkish nationalities may, if they so desire, be guaranteed autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire, consistently with the dignity of a sovereign State'. This is the claim that we must still continue to press, and in the words of this Manifesto, 'a reduction of the Muslim claim by a hair's breadth will not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Muslims, but will also be a flagrant violation of the solemn and relevant declarations and pledges made or given by responsible statesmen representing the Allied and Associated Powers, and given at a time when they were desirous of enlisting the support of the Muslim people and soldiery.'

In the course of the Delegation's interview with you, you were good enough to say that His Majesty's Government recognised that 'the Muslims of India have a right to be heard in a matter which affects especially Islam', and

you went on to say that His Majesty's Government had heard them, and not merely heard them, but 'had very largely deferred to their wishes in the matter' and that 'the settlement was very largely affected by the opinion of India and especially the Mussulmans of India.' Presumably you were referring on that occasion to the proposed retention of Constantinople by the Turks as the capital of their Empire. In this connection we desire to recall that the pledge which you gave on 5 January 1918, and which you recognised in the course of the Constantinople debate in the House of Commons on 26 February 1920, as having been deliberately given, after full consultation with all parties, with their consent, and as a national pledge, carefully prepared, specific and unqualified, covered not only Constantinople, but also 'the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace', which you acknowledged to be 'predominantly Turkish in race'.

But it is clear that in the Treaty Turkey does not in any real sense retain even Constantinople. With a bodyguard of the Sultan, 700 in number, to defend it against His Majesty's enemies, when it is within range of their guns, its defencelessness is obvious; and from your own statements in the House of Commons, it is equally obvious that it is to be kept defenceless by design. Moreover, the multiplicity of controls provided in various Articles of the Treaty for the Zone of the Straits, which includes the whole of this small Turkish enclave, and over the armed forces of Turkey generally, robs the Sultan of all sovereign rights in his own capital, and makes it nothing more than a prison in which the Head of the Muslim world would be kept as a hostage of the Principal Allied Powers. We have already protested against the occupation of Constantinople by British armed forces in circumstances of the greatest injustice, illegality and cruel violence, and it does not seem necessary for us to remind you that of all the 'enemy Powers' Turkey alone has been singled out for this form of unjustifiable coercion that is without parallel. This certainly does not demonstrate deference to Muslim wishes, but, on the contrary, suggests that discrimination has been exercised against the only Muslim Power that was ranged against the Allies in the War.

But in the case of Thrace and Smyrna, even the semblance of their retention by the Turks has been discarded. In this connection the position today cannot be expressed better than in your own words. In the course of your speech in the House of Commons on 26 February 1920, you had declared, with reference to your pledge of 5 January 1918, that 'the Mahommedan population of India were disturbed and they wanted a reassurance. We were making a special effort here to procure output for the War, and we were making a special effort in India to secure recruits. We needed all the men we could get for France, and what happened two or three months afterwards showed how important it was that we should secure all the support we could get in the East to do the fighting in Turkey. What is the effect of that statement? The effect of that statement in India was that recruiting went up appreciably from that very moment. They were not all

Mahommedans, but there were Mahommedans amongst them.... It is too often forgotten that we are the greatest Mahommedan Power in the world. One-fourth of the population of the British Empire is Mahommedan. There have been no more loyal adherents to the Throne, there has been no more effective loyal support to the Empire in its hour of trial than came from the Mahommedans of India. We gave a solemn pledge and they accepted it, and they are disturbed at the prospect of our not abiding by it.... India voluntarily sent to our aid 11,60,000 men who enlisted during the War; taking those who enlisted during the War and before it, very nearly a million and a half. We could not have conquered Turkey without their help. We had not the necessary troops. There were Mahommedan divisions that fought brilliantly throughout the whole of that Turkish campaign. Without their aid we should not have conquered Turkey at all. Were we to have broken faith with them in the hour of victory ? That is what we were confronted with. We might go to them and say, 'The circumstances have changed.... You might have said so, but I will tell you what they might have said. Whenever the British word was given again in the East, they would have said, 'Yes, you mean to keep faith, but you will always, somehow or other, find an unanswerable reason when the time comes for breaking it.' There is nothing which would damage British Power in Asia more than the feeling that you could not trust the British word. That is the danger. Of course, it would be a fatal reputation for us.' The danger to which you referred on that occasion not only exists today, but exists in a greater measure than before, and we would, therefore, respectfully urge that if the 'fatal reputation' you then desired to avoid must still be avoided, His Majesty's Government and their Allies must retrace their steps, and permit the Turks to retain within their dominion, not only Constantinople as a free capital of their Empire, but also 'the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race.'

In your interview with the Delegation, while stating that 'it was difficult to get the facts about Thrace,' you had said that you had the Turkish census and the Greek census before you, that there was very little difference between them, and that, according to both, 'the Muslim population in Thrace was in a considerable minority'; and you went on to say that 'if that is true, and the principle of self-determination is to be applied, the whole of Thrace would certainly be taken away from Turkish rule'. In this connection, we must, in the first place, point out that there was no suggestion in your speech only three weeks before of any doubt that the population of Thrace and Asia Minor were not still 'predominantly Turkish in race'. In the next place, we do not know how there could be a Greek census of territory still Turkish, and the only Turkish census from which your Secretary quoted figures was taken not only for Turkish Thrace but, as he himself stated, also for 'that part of Bulgarian Thrace ceded to the Allies by the Treaty of Neuilly', and was taken as long as a quarter of a century ago. Since then, as everybody knows,

enormous fluctuations in population have more than once occurred, and it is the Turkish element that has increased on account of immigration from violated Macedonia. It is true that Mr. Kerr also quoted figures according to 'the best estimate which the Foreign Office could make'; but he has refused to supply us with any information on the sources of this estimate, and respecting his statements about Greek evictions and deportations, which could enable us to judge of their accuracy. We submit we are, at any rate, entitled to know on what grounds the figures on which your pledge of 5 January 1918, was based, have since been discarded. If today, when the Turks are threatened with War, and there is danger of Great Britain acquiring, in your own words, a fatal reputation of finding unanswerable reasons when the time comes for breaking its faith, the least that Mussulmans are entitled to is a plebiscite to be taken in Thrace. But it should be taken under conditions leaving no possibility of doubt about its fairness and the absence of all compulsion, and we urge that the agency for taking such a plebiscite should include representatives of the All-India Khilafat Conference.

If anything, the case of Smyrna is even worse. The same pledge that was given in regard to Constantinople and Thrace was given in regard to 'the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor', which are also the ancient 'homelands of the Turks'. The official census of 1914 shows that in this, the richest province of Turkey's Asiatic Empire, there are only 3,00,000 Greeks as against 11,25,000 Mussulmans, and that in the Sanjak of Smyrna itself, where the Greek proportion is comparatively larger than elsewhere, there were 3,77,000 Mussulmans as against 2,18,000 Greeks. Against these figures the only ones that your private Secretary has supplied to us are based on some 'American estimates', about which we could get no further information from him. It is obvious that if this is all that has to be said in favour of such injustice, the Mussulmans cannot remain unmoved when, in the works of the Turkish Grand Vizier's reply, the Greeks are permitted to seize Asia Minor by the threat. As the Grand Vizier has said, to make Turkey renounce Smyrna would be to deprive her of half the commercial and agricultural value of Western Asia Minor, and no Free Zone could compensate her in any way for the damage sought to be done by dispossessing her of her rich homelands in Asia Minor.

You have already declared yourself on another occasion to be opposed to the application of the doctrine of self-determination to 'every fragment, every locality in every country throughout the world', and if, as you then said, a principle of that kind must be laid down—'within the limitations which common sense, which tradition will permit', then the enclave proposed to be handed over to Greek domination cannot be treated differently from the vilayet of Smyrna. But in any case, the arrangements sought to be made in the Treaty are obviously unjust and iniquitous. The Greek were not even at war with Turkey, and yet they were asked to reap the fruits of victory, which they did in the most cruel and inhuman fashion, and their forcible occupation of Smyrna, under the auspices of the Principal Allied Powers assumed, in the

words of the suppressed report of the Inter-Allied Commission, 'the aspect of a conquest and a crusade'. And while it is proposed to place Muslim majorities in Armenia under the subjection of Christian minorities, and justification is sought for such an arrangement in the allegations of cruelty against the Turks and Kurds, the Greeks, who indulged in revolting massacres and other excesses in Smyrna before the eyes of the Allies, are to administer that region, with the 'option' given to the population to decide five years later in favour of annexation with Greece, but not in favour of reversion to Turkish administration.

With regard to Armenia, the allegations of Turkish misrule are not admitted, and we greatly regret that you have refused to agree to our proposal of an International Commission, on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adquately represented, which could hold the first real, open inquiry into the allegations, and substitute for that which is nothing more than interested propaganda, the considered verdict of the civilised world. This was the suggestion which the Turks themselves had also urged, and we cannot infer from this unwillingness the Allies' desire to ascertain the truth.

Nevertheless, the Delegation would gladly agree that non-Turkish nationalities may, if they so desire, be guaranteed autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire consistently with the dignity of the latter as a sovereign State. The fidelity of the Kurds, in spite of interested efforts made to seduce them from their loyalty to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, has remained unshaken; and if the Christian inhabiting Turkish Armenia would not agree to an exchange of Muslim population with Christian between Turkey and the Republic of Erivan, they could be just as effectively protected as a minority as the Indian Mussulmans themselves has been protected in India. After a careful study of the history of the disturbances in Armenia, and the peaceful conditions prevailing there before Czarist Russian intrigues effectively disturbed them, we have every reason to believe that, if interested interference from the outside ceases, Muslims and Christians there could once more live together in peace. But to lop off any portion of the four vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, in which Mussulmans number 20,83,000 or 80 per cent of the total population as against 3,62,000 or 13 per cent. Christian Armenians, as the Treaty contemplates, would be a most unjust and iniquitous proceeding. It would clearly suggest that 'the religious issue' is involved and that underneath the stupendous agitation that has been carried on unchecked, particularly in Great Britain, there is a good deal of 'the old feeling of Christendom against Crescent', which, as you rightly said in the House of Commons, in the course of the Constantinople debate, would be fatal to British Government in India. And in view of the fact that in the course of the War the Principal Allied Powers had agreed to hand over Turkish Armenia not to the Christians of Armenia, but to the tyrannical and intolerant Government of the Czar of Russia, it will not be possible today to convince unprejudiced opinion that the proposals of the Treaty with respect

to Armenia are based on a just regard for the interests of the Armenians themselves.

Apart from the territorial clauses of the Treaty, which seek to reduce the Empire of the Khalifa to limits incompatible alike with the principles of nationality and the obligations of Islamic Law, there are the political clauses, military, naval and air clauses, financial clauses and economic clauses, too numerous to be dealt with here in any detail, which unmistakably seek to take away the strength and the independence which are requisite both for the maintenance of the Khilafat and the continued existence of Turkey as a sovereign State. After reducing the armed forces of the Khilafat to an amazing degree, the Principal Allied Powers have devised checks and controls for the remnants left to it to which no Mussulman could ever agree. The preamble to Part V introducing these clauses, declares that Turkey is required strictly to observe these clauses 'in order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations.' But, in view of the fact that the armaments of the Principal Allied Powers have assumed such vast proportions, while the existing forces of Turkey, if they remained intact, could by no stretch of imagination be supposed to render impossible the initiation of such a laudable task as the general limitation of armaments, one would have expected that the reduction demanded from Turkey would have been initiated by the Principal Allied Powers in respect of their own armaments. Therefore, since they have not thought fit to do so, it would be futile on their part to expect the Mussulmans of the world to reconcile themselves to a reduction of the armed forces of the Khilafat, which must always bear such a proportion to the armed forces of the rest of the world, that Muslim apprehensions with regard to the defence of their faith may reasonably be allayed. The meagre forces which the Khilafat is to be permitted to retain cannot reasonably be expected to allay these apprehensions, and the Mussulmans cannot therefore consent to the required reduction.

Still less can they consent to the Allied control which is sought in the Treaty to be exercised over the armed forces of the Khilafat. These are impossible conditions which are subversive alike of the Islamic institution of the Khilafat and of the independence of Turkey as a sovereign State.

Similar devices have been embodied in the Draft Treaty with regard to Turkish finance, and it is manifest that they are calculated, and no doubt intended, to put an end to the Empire of the Khilafa as sovereign State.

These are measures which the Mussulmans of India could never countenance, and their practical inference could only have the effect of abrogating the bond of loyalty which they have so far willingly and steadfastly maintained. The question being one of faith and of profoundly cherished religious, obligations, no compromise, as we have more than once already pointed out, is possible.

Even at this eleventh hour, therefore, we solemnly urge upon His Majesty's Government to modify their policy towards Turkey, and their intentions in

regard to mandates in Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, which are part of the Jazirat-ul-Arab. Any attempt to enforce the present Treaty cannot but alienate, and, if persisted in, permanently estrange the Mussulmans of India, and with them the rest of their Indian compatriots.

Already a programme of peaceful progressive cessation of co-operation with government has been arranged, commencing with the renunciation of honours and titles conferred by government, and ending in the resignation of all employees, including the police and the army, and the non-payment of taxes; while the Mussulmans have reserved to themselves, in the event of the failure of non-cooperation, the right of taking such other steps in defence of their religious freedom as Islamic Law may dictate or permit.

Already a very large number of Mussulmans, who could not reconcile their conscience with subjection to a Power which appeared to them to be so hostile to the Khilafat, have migrated into other lands; and a much larger number is about to migrate. We need not dilate upon the calamitous consequences, immediate and ultimate, as insistence on the acceptance of this Treaty would involve; and we would, therefore, in the name of our people, earnestly urge upon His Majesty's Government and their Allies the withdrawal of the present Treaty, and its substitution by a more equitable, conciliatory and statesmanlike document. A treaty that would respect the religious obligations of the Muslim world and the national sentiment of India, and assure to the Turkish Empire a progressive and independent sovereign government, would also help to initiate a new understanding, consolidate the old freindship beetween the Allies and Turkey and pacify and reassure Islam.

It is to the future rather than to the past that our eyes should now be turned, and instead of throwing a challenge to the Muslim world, as this Treaty is calculated to do, the forces of Islam should rather be mustered in the interests of peace and progress.

It seems that, in spite of numerous highly significant indications the gravity of the issue has not yet been realised. A choice is being forced on the Mussulmans between obedience to the clearest commandments of God and obedience to the dictates of mundane governments, and in such a case Mussulmans can only act on the dictum of their Prophet, that 'no obedience is due to a creature of God which involves disobedience towards the Creator'.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, July 1920.

11

CALL GIVEN BY THE NON-COOPERATION COMMITTEE

July, 1920

Although every effort is being made to secure revision of the Peace Terms it appears to be almost certain that it will not come before the first of August next. The Committee desires to mark the sacred character of the forthcoming demonstration of Non-cooperation in a fitting manner. It also wishes to gauge the public feeling in the matter. The Committee, therefore, seeks the co-operation of Hindus and other non-Muslim communities in making the inauguration a complete success.

1. The Committee advise full 'Hartal' on the first of August. Mill-hands, however, are requested not to abstain from work, unless they receive permission from their employers, nor should all those abstain who are required for absolutely necessary day-to-day work, viz., hospital men, sanitary men and dock labourers.

2. The day should be devoted to prayer. All those, who come should fast for the day.

3. Meeting should be held all over the country not excluding the smallest village at which the following resolution should be adopted with or without speeches.

THE RESOLUTION

'This meeting held at ......of the inhabitants records the full sympathy with the movement of the Central Khilafat Committee in order to secure revision of the Turkish Peace Terms, consistently with Muslim sentiment and Islamic Law and approves of Non-cooperation adopted by the Central Khilafat Committee to be continued till the Peace Terms are revised. This meeting respectfully urges the Imperial Government in the interest of the Empire which they are supposed to represent, to secure a just revision of the terms which have been universally condemned as unjust and manifestly in breach of ministerial declaration.'

The resolution should be sent to His Excellency the Viceroy with a covering letter requesting him to forward the same to the Imperial Government. The Central Khilafat Committee should be advised of the passing of the resolution and of its despatch.

NOT A MOVEMENT OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

There should be no processions. Speeches should be restrained. It is expected that meeting everywhere will be very largely attended. All police and other Governmental instruction should be strictly and scrupulously obeyed.

No meetings should be held where there is any written prohibition. It cannot be too often urged that the whole success of the movement depends upon perfect peace being observed by the community and complete obedience being rendered to police instructions in connection with the movement. It should be clearly understood that this is not a movement of Civil Disobedience. What should be done when unreasonable orders are issued interfering the liberty of the subject will be considered on the merits by the Committee.

It is expected that all title-holders, Honorary Magistrates, Justices of Peace, Members of the Legislative Councils, who feel about this important question affecting the well being of million of Muslims, and who are in sympathy with the movement, will surrender their titles or honorary posts on this day.

M. K. Gandhi.	Abul Kalam Azad.
Shaukat Ali.	Ahmed Haji Siddick Khatri.
Saifuddin Kitchlew.	Fazul Hasan.
Hasrat Mohani.	Mahomed Ali.

Members, Non-cooperation Committee, Bombay.

August 1st was thus declared to be the third Khilafat day. The Non-co-operation Committee further issued the following directions.

The first of August is on us with its grave responsibility and important consequences. We believe that success for our just cause is certain if we exercise greatest self-restraint and show ample measure of self-sacrifice. If we cease to help Government and cease to take help from it we must be capable of preserving order in the country. We should therefore avoid collision with authority and thus also occasion for sudden resentment, obey all orders and Government notices. We hope there will be complete Hartal on Sunday. No pressure should be used against anyone refusing to close shop. The Committee attaches greatest importance to prayer and fasting for inward strength and purification. We hope too that the largest meeting ever held will be convened on Sunday but there should be no processions. Special effort should be made and continued to secure surrender of titles and honorary posts and parents are requested to withdraw their children from schools recognised by or under Government control. Lawyers are requested to suspend practice.

We have no doubt about the moral effect of these steps. We hope also that full Swadeshi will be inaugurated on Sunday. It enables every man, woman and child to exhibit in their own persons the spirit of sacrifice for the sake of our religion and honour and a preparation for further sacrifice. Agitation for securing complete boycott of Councils should be continued unabated. Finally the Committee expects Muslims to lead as well in preserving peace and order as in sacrifice and we feel sure that our Hindus brethren will not fail to respond and join the Muslims.'

Source : **Indian Annual Register, 1921.**

12

DR. SAIFUDDIN KITCHLEW'S 'A DRAFT PROGRAMME FOR MUSSULMANS'

For sometime past the conviction has been forcing itself on many earnest and thoughtful minds that a readjustment of the national programme before the Muslim community has become a necessity, if it is to withstand the onslaught of the forces of reaction that are now gathering strength. The present unsettled state of affairs with regard to Khilafat has reacted on the activities of the communities and as a result national work among Muslims has received a set-back. A new and more dynamic programme embracing the whole phase of the life of the community show now be thought out, and a reorientation given to all-India organisations. For this purpose it is necessary that the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and Khilafat Committee should meet in the special session. The present religious and political position should be considered in all its aspects and the conference should decide on the advisability or otherwise of continuing without alteration the present programme of the Khilafat Movement. The question of organising the community on different lines for purpose of taking their due place in the affairs of the country and in the struggle for Swarajya should also be considered there.... I consider it a moral and patriotic duty that every Mussulman should :

1. Join the Congress.
2. Make common sense with other cummunities in the fight for *Swaraj*.
3. Work directly and in all possible manner for Hindu-Muslim unity.

He also suggested :

1. The office of the Central Khilafat Committee should be removed from Bombay to Delhi.
2. The Jamia Millia of Aligarh should be converted into an organisation for the training of political workers and its habitation should be shifted to Delhi.
3. The establishment of a library, a press and one Urdu and one English Daily newspaper at Delhi.
4. Efforts should be made to establish Maktabs in all mosques to develop a special primary education system for the Muslims.
5. The *Waqf* property should be controlled on a communal basis.
6. Technological Institutes and colleges for instruction in applied science should be opened with a view to encourage Mussulmans to take greater part in trade, industry and agriculture.
7. *Tabligh* ...should be carried on by the Jamiat-ul-Ulema independently of the political organisation.

8. With a view to discourage litigation and for the amicable settlement of dispute, Panchayat should be established all over the country.

Source: A Draft Programme for Mussulmans by Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew. Printed at Amritsar.

13

REPRESENTATION MADE TO THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF THE PUNJAB BY THE SAJJADA NASHINS AND THE PEASANTS AND THE MILITARY CLASSES OF THE PUNJAB REGARDING THE KHILAFAT

We, the representatives of the Sajjada Nashins and the peasant and military section of the Muslims of the Punjab Province, beg leave to express our views regarding the question of the Khilafat and the Peace terms between the Allied Powers and the Ottoman Empire.

During the last year a great anxiety has been felt regarding the above two questions, which are of vital importance to the British Empire and the Muslim world, and the Indian Muslims of all sections and opinions view the matter with the gravest concern. During the recent war the Muslims of the Punjab displayed their devotion and loyalty by voluntarily enlisting themselves in the British Army in large numbers with a view to fight for the Empire in all the theatres of the Great War, and after the solemn pledge given by the Premier of England in January, 1918, they exerted themselves with double energies in bringing the war to a victorious end. Having full confidence in the solemn pledge of the Premier and the brilliant traditions of the wise policy of Great Britain, they firmly believed that in view of the fact that they had deep religious and spiritual connections with the Khalifa and the Khilafat, and that it was absolutely essential for the British Government to have friendly relations with the Muslim world, Great Britain would succeed in traversing the difficult paths of religious differences. The agitation started by Lord Robert Cecil and the Christian priests of the West is, none-the-less, a crusade against Islam. It naturally gives an opportunity to the rise of the Jehad movement, and has set on foot the mutual clash between the Cross and the Crescent. This agitation is eventually dangerous to the high aims of the British Empire, of which we are proud to be humble citizens, well-wishers, and protectors. Though the peasant and military sections, whom we represent, are mostly illiterate, yet they have got deep and sincere religious and spiritual connections with the Khalifa and his Empire. Your Honour and His Excellency the

Viceroy are thoroughly acquainted with these sentiments, though the fanatics of England do not admit them to be true.

In these circumstances we deem it our duty to request your Honour again to convey our feelings and sentiments to our popular King Emperor and his Ministers.

The peasent and military classes of the Punjab request that the Ottoman Empire should be left as it was before the outbreak of the War, *i.e.*, the temporal power of the Khalifa should be preserved, the different nations under the Ottoman rule may be supported for their legitimate claim for Self-Government, and the Holy Places of Islam and Jazirat-ul-Arab as defined by the Muslim religious authorities should be free from any direct or indirect control of foreign Powers.

We cannot conclude without offering our gratitude to your Honour for your sympathetically hearing the grief and sorrow in which all the Muslims are involved, and we are confident that your Honour has fully realised the feelings and requests we have ventured to express.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, June 1920.

14

LETTER FROM MAHATMA GANDHI TO VICEROY

As one who has enjoyed a certain measure of your Excellency's confidence and as one who claims to be a devoted well-wisher of the British Empire, I owe it to Your Excellency and through Your Excellency, to His Majesty's Ministers to explain my connection with, and my conduct in, the Khilafat question.

At the very earliest stage of the war, even whilst I was in London, organising the Indian volunteer ambulance corps, I began to interest myself in the Khilafat question. I perceived how deeply moved the little Mussulman world in London was when Turkey decided to throw in her lot with Germany. On my arrival in India in January of 1915 I found the same anxiousness and earnestness among the Mussulmans with whom I came in contact. Their anxiety became intense when information about secret treaties leaked out. Distrust of British intentions filled their minds and despair took possession of them. Even at that moment, I advised my Mussulman friends not to give way to despair but to express their fears and their hopes in a disciplined manner. It will be admitted that the whole of the Mussulman India has behaved in a singularly restrained manner during the past five years and that

leaders have been able to keep the turbulent sections of their community under complete control.

The Peace terms and Your Excellency's defence of them have given the Mussulmans of India a shock from which it will be difficult for them to recover. The terms violate Ministerial pledges and utterly disregard the Mussulmans sentiment. I consider that, as a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussulmans countrymen, I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In my humble opinion, their cause is just. They claim that Turkey must not be punished if their sentiment is to be respected. Muslim soldiers did not fight to inflict punishment on their own Khalifa, or to deprive him of his territories. The Mussulman attitude has been consistent throughout these five years. My duty to the Empire to which I owe my loyalty requires me to resist the cruel violence that had been done to Mussulman sentiment.

NON-COOPERATION—THE ONLY REMEDY

So far as I am aware, the Mussulmans and Hindus have, as a whole, lost faith in British justice and honour. The report of the majority of the Hunter Committee, Your Excellency's despatch thereon and Mr. Montagu's reply, have only aggravated the distrust. In these circumstances, the only courses open to one like me is either in despair to sever all connection with British rule, or if I still retained the faith in the inherent superiority of British Constitution to all others at present in vogue, to adopt such means as will rectify the wrong done and thus restore confidence. I have not lost faith in such superiority and I am not without hope. Somehow or other justice will yet be rendered if we show requisite capacity for suffering. Indeed my conception of that constitution is that it helps only those who are ready to help themselves. I don't believe it protects the weak. It gives free scope to the strong to maintain their strength and develop it. The weak under it go to the wall. It is then because I believe in British constitution that I have advised my Mussulman friends to withdraw their support from Your Excellency's Government and the Hindus to join them, should peace terms not be revised in accordance with the solemn pledges of the ministers and the Muslim sentiment.

Three courses were open to the Mahommedans in order to mark their emphatic disapproval of the utter injustice to which His Majesty's Minister have become party if they have not actually been the prime perpetrators of it. They are (1) to resort to violence, (2) to advise emigration on a whole scale (3) not to be party to the injustice by ceasing to co-operate with the Government. Your Excellency must be aware that there was a time when the boldest though also the most thoughtless among the Mussulmans favoured violence and that Hijrat (emigration) has not yet ceased to be the battle cry. I venture to claim I have succeeded by patient reasoning in weaning the party of violence from its ways. I confess that I did not attempt to succeed in weaning them

from violence on moral grounds but purely on utilitarian grounds. The result for the time being at any rate has however been to stop violence. The school of Hijrat has received a check if it has not stopped its activity entirely.

I hold that no repression could have prevented a violent eruption if the people had not had presented to them a form of direct action involving considerable sacrifice and ensuring success if such direct action was largely taken up by public. Non-cooperation was the only dignified and constitutional form of such direct action. For it is a right recognised from time immemorial of the subjects to refuse to assist the ruler who misrules. At the same time I admit non-cooperation practised by the mass of people is attended with grave risks. But in a crisis such as has overtaken the Mussulmans of India no step that is unattended with large risks can possibly bring about the desired change. Not to run some risks will be to count much greater risks if not the virtual destruction. The Mussulman representation has requested Your Excellency to hold the agitation yourself as did your distinguished predecessor at the time of the South African trouble, but if you cannot see your way to do so and non-cooperation becomes the dire necessity, I hope Your Excellency will give those who accepted my advice and myself credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty.

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1921.**

15

NON-COOPERATION : THE ONLY OR THE LAST WEAPON

When some of the advocates of a policy of non-cooperation in connection with the Khilafat question say that non-cooperation is our only way, all that they prabably mean is that it is our last weapon. And in this they are unquestionably right. Non-Cooperation may or may not be indentical with passive resistence; it is obvious that in some of its phases it resists nothing, whether passively or otherwise. It certainly moves on the same plane as passive resistance, has substantially the same origin and the same justification, works in substantially the same way and aims at substantially the same effect. As in the case of passive resistance, it is either a moral or a political weapon, and owes its existence either to conscientious scruples or to the desire to produce a political effect. Very often, as in the case of the Khilafat, it is both the one and the other. Mr. Gandhi, with whom the movement in its present form has originated, has justified it on both grounds, on the moral ground because those who believe in Khilafat have, in his opinion, every co-operation

from a Power that is a party to the present settlement of the Turkish question which no true Mussulman can accept and which is at variance with the pledged word of the Premier, on the political ground because Mr. Gandhi has confided that by withholding co-operation from the British Government the Indian Mussulmans backed by the rest of the Indian people, will succeed in bringing about revision of the Turkish Treaty in consonance with the dictates of their religion and their own wishes.

But whether in the one case or in the other non-cooperation is clearly the last, and not the only, weapon in our armoury. Conscience does not require that whenever a man does, a wrong or an injustice and the very moment he does it, we should go up to him and say, 'either undo it or we shall have nothing to do with you.' Were this the position conscience would be the worst of tyrants, and would constantly be at loggerheads not only with men's obvious self interest but with sanity, proportion and commonsense. Nor would any one think of using for a political purpose so drastic a remedy, involving as it must often do such a tremendous lot of suffering both for ourselves and others, except in the last resort, when all other, simpler and less drastic remedies have been tried and have failed, and when there is a reasonable chance of its success. In both cases what has to be remembered is that non-cooperation is only and strictly a substitute for violance, and can and should be resorted to only in those cases where a prudent man would in other days and under other conditions have resorted to force. It is a tremendous reserve power, but for that very reason not a power to be requisitioned except when there is the clearest need and the conditions are such that we have every reason to expect more good than harm from its use.

And when we say this let us hasten to add that we are not among those who advocate non-cooperation (in appropriate cases and on an appropriate scale) only on the ground that we are a weak nation. Non-cooperation is the weapon eqally of the strong and the weak, provided both the strong and the weak, are equally reasonable, equally human, equally justice-loving and equally uptodate in their ideas and ideals. 'Violence', as a distinguished writer has told us, 'is always an evil and always the root of evil, though it is not the worst of evils, so long as it does not mean the obliteration of the sense of righteousness and duty.' And non-cooperation or passive resistence is, after all, the only acceptable substitute for violence in extreme cases. From another point of view, non-cooperation is more the weapon of the strong than of the weak. It requires a courage, a patience, a power of endurance and, above all, a capacity for subordinating present comfort and convenience to future good, and often personal good itself to the good of the community, of which only the strongest among us are capable. Everyone can resort to violence, though every one may not make violence successful. It is no uncommon experience that in a dispute between a strong and a weak man, it is the latter, who, as often as not, strikes the first blow, either because he is not confident of ultimate victory or because he has no control over his

temper. Not so in the case of the man who deliberately resorts to a life of trial and suffering because he finds that there is no other way either to satisfy his conscience or to secure the undoing of a personal or a national wrong. Such a man may act impulsively and unwisely, and the whole of our contention in this case is that the less impulsive the decision is in a particular case, the greater the strength it exhibits. But it is the grossest of fallacies to any that because violence is eliminated the party must be weak. Those who say so confound brute force with strength and forget that the whole tendency of civilisation is towards subordinating brute force to intellectual and moral force.

Source : The Tribune, June 1920.

16

NON-COOPERATION IN INDIA

Mahatma Gandhi has sent a cable to Mr. Mohamed Ali, head of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, from Bombay, on 25 June, which reached London on Monday last, 28 June, in which he says that 'respectful but firm Mussulman representation, influentially signed, announcing resort to non-cooperation from 1 August, if the Turkish peace terms are not revised, or if the Viceroy does not heed the Khilafat Agitation, is now in His Excellency's hands. I have sent my own separate representation, explaining my connection with the movement and associating myself entirely with it. In my opinion the vast majority of the Muslim and Hindu masses are behind this great and just agitation for the respect of Muslim religious sentiment, and for ensuring the fulfilment of Ministerial pledges. You may be sure of everything possible being done on this side. I have no doubt that in this great cause God will help us if we but help ourselves.'

A letter signed by 92 Sunni Muslim, claiming to represent the largest body of Sunni opinion, has been addressed to the Viceroy, requesting him to ask His Majesty's Ministers to secure the revision of the Peace terms, and failing compliance to resign his high office. If this suggestion is not adopted, cooperation with the government will be withdrawn from 1 August and their Hindu brethren will be asked to adopt the same course.

The Sunni claim to be loyal subjects of the Crown, but they place their loyalty to Islam as a first consideration. The hope is expressed that non-cooperation with the government will be unnecessary, but if it should prove

necessary violence will be avoided, and the least possible dislocation and embarrassment to the government will be caused.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, July, 1920.

17

LETTER FROM MOHAMED ALI TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES REGARDING THE MUSLIM REFUGEES FROM INDIA

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Compassionate.

Is it not enough that the anti-Turkish and anti-Muslim policy which you have been unceasingly advocating with regard to the Turkish settlement should have succeeded in driving away from their homes hundreds of Indian Mussulmans, particularly from Sindh, the first Indian province where Islam set its foot 120 years ago ? Is it not enough that, even when these people were within three or four miles of the boundary of British India, they should have been molested by military police, reinforced by a military officer, on the absurd excuse that they had no railway ticket to traverse this short distance when they had already travelled hundreds of miles, and that they should have been fired upon in the ruthless manner now being increasingly associated with British Indian Administration ? Must your Lahore correspondent also add insult to these manifold injuries, and at the sight of women and children leaving their home for conscience's sake jeer at them and pretend to be surprised that the emigrants had not adopted 'the plan of divorcing their wives to save travelling expenses' ? There is not so little of divorce in your own country today that you could afford to give publicity to the gibes that your Lahore correspondent chooses to fling at Islam and the Mussulmans ! But I must not imitate him, and so desist from further comment.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, July, 1920.

18

LETTER FROM SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI TO THE EDITOR MUSLIM OUTLOOK

Without entering into the merits or demerits of Bolshevism, one may well ask those Western Powers, particularly Great Britain and France, who consider Bolshevism to be a danger, what measures they intend to adopt to stop the spread of Bolshevism in the East. The French idea of having a barbed wire fence round has failed. Petty States cannot stop the avalanche. The only way to stop the spread of Bolshevism in the East is to use the wall of Islam from Thrace to Khyber, and everybody knows that the key to that wall is Turkey.

British statesmen, if they have any knowledge of history, cannot forget that for scores of years past the Turkish Empire was a check upon the desire of the Czars of Russia to dominate the East. How often Turkey has fought against Russia in the last century, and thus saved India and also Persia from being overrun.

It is an irony of fate that Britain herself has destroyed Turkey and alienated Islam. Now nothing can stop Russian domination of the East. Whoever may the ruler of Persia be, Bolsheviks or Czars, the whole of the East will be at their mercy as soon as they organise their military machine. If matters are allowed to go on as they are going on at present, the people of Asia Minor, Azerbaijan, Persia, Mesopotamia, Afghanistan, and even India, will welcome Russia, even if it is Bolshevik, rather than live as they are living these days.

Britain seems determined to destroy her own Empire in the East for the sake of Greek Imperialism.

Nothing has pained Muslims more than the sufferings inflicted upon the Turks through Greeks by England, and not until amends are made for that, and Thrace, with the sacred city of Adrianople and Smyrna are freed from the Greek scourge, can any friendship be expected from Muslims by England or France, nor can Bolshevism be checked.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, September 1920.

19

LETTER FROM MOHAMED ALI TO THE EDITOR MUSLIM OUTLOOK

Last weak I had occasion to express my surprise at the Government of India publishing the contradiction of a report, which had been sufficiently widely spread by the Press in this country, as if it had emanated from me.

This week's *Indian mail* brings another communique published by that government, in which it seeks to disprove certain allegations to which the Indian Khilafat Delegation had invited the attention of the Allied representatives. It is, therefore, once more necessary to state that these report have not emanated from us in the first instance, and that we can undertake no responsibility for their accuracy. The allegation that about 15,000 Turkish nationalist prisioners taken at Balikessri were killed by the Greeks, was published, as stated in the Delegation's protest itself, by the *Morning Post*, and emanated from that journals' Constantinople correspondent.

I understand that the Prime Minister has since sought to disprove this on the authority of the Greeks themselves, an authority on which he has learnt to lean more and more every day. But even if the allegation can, on that account, be said to have been satisfactorily disproved, it concerns the *Morning Post* and its Constantinople correspondent more than the Indian Khilafat Delegation, who felt bound to protest against the treacherous inhumanity of the Greeks, when that journal felt justified in giving publicity to its correspondent's gruesome report.

One thing is certain. In spite of what the Government of India has to say, there is no possibility that 'the report of the massacre of 15,000 Turkish prisoners at Balikessri is due to some confusion with an earlier report that 15,000 Muslims, including men, women and children, were massacred by the Bolshevik troops who invaded the Azerbijan Republic as a result of the intrigues of Mustafa Kemal'. This may or may not be very skilful anti-Bolshevik and anti-Turkish propaganda, carried on in the guise of an innocent-looking contradiction of allegations made against a British Admiral and the Greek instruments of Britain's anti-Turkish and anti-Islamic policy. But one wonders if it did not appear far-fetched to the authors of the communique to suggest the possibility of 'some confusion', when they had easy enough access to the Indian Khilafat 'Delegation's protest, clearly giving their authority for the allegation that had provoked it.

As regards the other allegation, the threat of the British Admiral to bombard the Mosque and town of Broussa was first published by the *Temps* of Paris, to which I immediately addressed a letter suggesting that such outrageous action should not go unrebuked in a country which had not yet

recovered from its feeling of indignation at the bombardment of the Cathedrals of Rheims and Soissons.

I may, perhaps, add that ordinarily one would have expected the British authorities to have communicated such information as they had to give on the subject to the Delegation also, and not to have left us to read it six or seven weeks later in a newspaper received by the Indian mail. But then, perhaps, one must no longer expect from the British authorities what one expects ordinarily from others.

Source: The Muslim Outlook, September 1920.

20

MAULANA SHAUKAT ALI ON HIJRAT AND NON-COOPERATION

In appears from the comments in a large section of the public press that the opinion of the Central Khilafat Committee on the question of Hijrat is being sought. It is therefore necessary that I should express my opinion on this matter.

It is an admitted fact that two movements cannot succeed simultaneously, and such a course is bound to mar the unity of thought and combined action which are essential for the achievement of our object. Moreover, it does not tend to bring about uniformity and united force in the community. It is therefore that the Central Khilafat Committee did not take this upon themselves. For the non-cooperation resolution was adopted by common consent at Allahabad, and as a result of this decision all Khilafat members and workers are duty bound to devote all their energy in making the programme thus adopted a complete success. But (God forbid) if this movement fails, it would become the duty of the Khilafat Committee to decide upon some other line of action, and if then the Ulema and public opinion agreed upon Hijrat the Khilafat Committee would exert as much for its success as they have done and propose to do for non-cooperation.

As a Mussulman and a servant of the Khilafat Committee, I personally appreciate the efforts of those gentlemen who are carrying on propaganda in favour of Hijrat, and I pray for their success. But so long as non-cooperation is not pushed to its logical conclusion I regret I am unable to join the Hijrat movement, and evidently the Khilafat Committee, too, cannot undertake the responsibility. The movement of non-cooperation should not be understood as non-religious or as having no connection with Hijrat or Jehad. Nor should

it be understood that it is merely the invention of political brains after the model of Western diplomacy, and as separate from Islamic institutions; or that in this purely religious question, Khilafat meetings have been adopted as a political weapon in defiance of all Islamic laws. But the fact is that non-cooperation is named *Tark-i-mawalat*, in the language of *Shariat*, and it has been inculcated and taught clearly in the Divine Book. It has also been explained therein when and in regard to whom non-cooperation is to be resorted to. Non-cooperation is therefore a form of Jehad, and the enjoinments of non-cooperation have been given with the same clearness and force as those of Jehad. Thus says the 'Quran'.

'Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of (your) religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly; surely Allah loves the doers of justice.'

'Allah only forbids you respecting those who made war upon you on account of (your) religion, and drove you forth from your homes and backed up (others) in your expulsion, that you make friends with them and whoever makes friends with them, these are unjust.'

Again the 'Quran' says :

'O, You who believe ! do not take My enemy and your enemy for friends; would you offer them love ?' (Mohamed Ali's translation of the 'Quran').

There are several other texts bearing on this matter, in which non-cooperation with the enemies of Islam has been strictly enjoined and those who do not cease co-operation have been described in the traditions thus : Who ever befriends the enemies of Islam is from among them.

Renunciation of titles, resignation of honorary offices and government posts are a kind of serverance of connections and are therefore included in the scheme of non-cooperation. It is true that the stages of non-cooperation which we are about to inaugurate are the most insignificant factors of that scheme which has been enjoined upon us in the above mentioned texts. And I fear we may have to stand charged the infirmity in Divine Presence.

Even under these circumstances if British Ministers and responsible officers of the Government fail to recognise our peaceful conduct and avoidance of violence, it should be a matter of great wonder that we should be pursuing most ineffective methods in the face of most drastic and extreme measures which are being taken in destroying Khilafat and dismembering Turkey. Nevertheless, it has been thought fit to give one more and the last opportunity to the British Cabinet, by adopting the first two stages of non-cooperation, to avoid the danger of being counted as enemies of Islam as described in the aforesaid taxes and in regard to whom the Divine Book contains most stringent commandments.

It must be clearly borne in mind that we do not initiate the first two stages of non-cooperation because *Shariyat* orders these and no more, or that

we are not capable of a more vigorous action, or that we are afraid of the extinction of our movement on account of difficulties that it might entail. But as a matter of fact we want to conduct this as our religious and national movement on the principle of gradual progress. However, as soon as it is brought home to us that our efforts in this direction do not lead to the desired result, we would necessarily adopt a more effective method whether it be *Hijrat* or some other course. Further, these stages are only meant to afford time and opportunity for preparations for further stages of non-cooperation.

It is our prayer that our present policy may suffice to open the eyes of the British Government, at least for the safety to their own Empire if not for the sanctity of the pledges. Justice is the fundamental principle of every Government and deviation from this path is bound to lead to destruction. I wish to make it clear to the public that were it possible to avert this grave danger to the good name and existence of Islam, we should not have adopted non-cooperation. But it must be remembered that although patience and forbearance are no strange qualities in us, it is impossible to forget the religious obligations.

It is hoped that all my co-religionists as well as my esteemed countrymen would exert their utmost to make non-cooperation a success. I further appeal to them to avoid every kind of difference and division and to support this movement with an undivided mind and singleness of purpose.

'It lies in God to grant us strength'.

—*The Quran.*

Source : The Muslim Outlook, August 1920.

21

AFGHAN WELCOME TO INDIAN MUSLIMS : FIRMAN ISSUED BY THE AMIR OF AFGHANISTAN REGARDING INDIAN MUSLIM IMMIGRANTS

(1) Whosoever desires to immigrate into Afghanistan should either get himself registered as an Afghan national or obtain the permit to enter Afghanistan at Peshawar or at the Afghan Frontier Outpost. The moment he sets his foot on Afghan soil he shall be entitled to all rights and privileges of an Afghan subject and shall be considered to have placed himself under the law of the Shariat and of Afghanistan.

(2) Those who enter Afghanistan and offer their allegiance to the

Government of Afghanistan will get six *jareebs* (about four acres) of arable land for their maintenance if they be unmarried, and eight *jareebs* if they be married. Boys who have not reached the age of puberty and unmarried girls will not be given any land.

(3) Until the crops are ready for harvest every adult will be given five kabuli seers of flour per month, and every child, from the age of six till he or she reaches puberty, will be given three kabuli seers of flour every month as allowances for guests. This allowance will cease in the case of adults when the harvest is gathered.

(4) Those who are granted land will also receive in the first year six seers of wheat per *jareeb* as seed and also five rupees per *jareeb* for buying agricultural implements as *taqavi* (advance). The amount of the *taqavi* so advanced will be realised from them in suitable instalments in the fourth, fifth and sixth years.

(5) No revenue will be charged for lands granted to Indian immigrants for the first three years. The rules of the land revenue code will apply to them from the fourth year.

(6) Indian immigrants shall not carry on any political activities without consulting the interests of Afghanistan.

(7) Those among the immigrants who have received good education or are skilled in some art or handicraft will be employed in Afghan service suitable to their qualifications and will receive salaries for such service, provided that the Afghan Government is in need of their services. Those who do not join Government service will be at liberty to follow any trade or profession they like.

(8) An office will be opened at Jabalus Siraj for one month or more as need be to arrange for the housing and to render general assistance to Indian immigrants. After this the immigrants will be given lands and settled in parts of Afghanistan as suits the necessities and requirements of the Afghan Government. They will be housed in Government buildings and will be given accommodation suitable to their wants. In cases where a Government building is not available new buildings will be erected for their accommodation.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, July 1920.

22

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION'S FAREWELL MESSAGE

The Indian Khilafat Delegation leave London tomorrow morning, and in a fortnight's time we would have sailed away from England on our homeward journey. When we set out from India seven months ago, the Indian people charged us to explain to the Allied nations and their Governments the obligations imposed on every Mussulman by his faith and the views and sentiments of the Indian nation with regard to the Turkish Settlement, which directly affected the future of the Khilafat and political control in the Holy Places of Islam. The loyalty of the Mussulmans and in fact all Indian communities to every ruler, be he Christian, Hindu or Mussulman, has always been strictly conditional on the ruler's respecting the religious obligations of the people, and it was precisely because we desired to remain as loyal as we had always been in the past that we came all the way to make sure that the Allied nations and their Governments understood and appreciated our religious responsibilities and did not conclude a settlement with Turkey in direct contravention of our faith.

These really are not the days any longer of autocrats whose whims and caprices have got to be studied by their subjects. These are days when Governments, if they desire to remain in power, have got to study the wishes of the people whom they govern. Nevertheless, when our people found that the Government of Great Britain was in great danger of ignoring, not only our views and sentiments, but also our religious obligations, which had to be respected, if it was desired that we should remain loyal, we were sent out on this mission, and now that we are departing after six months's stay in Europe, it should not be necessary for us to say what vast population we represented. At any rate, the Government of India knew that before it consented to provide the necessary facilities for our Delegation to visit Europe and America, and events of no small magnitude are occurring today in India which tell their own tale. The least that they signify is that the Khilafat agitation was not fictitious or factitious, as some interested person in this country, who should have known better, pretended to think. It is not a few agitators that disturb the peace and quietness of the teeming millions of India. The leaders have only been the spokesmen of the people and today they are the one restraining influence. So far they have successfully prevented all violence. When the Delegation returns to India, they intend to throw the whole weight of their influence into the same scale. But we cannot leave these shores without expressing our great disappointment at the anti-Turkish, anti-Islamic and anti-Indian policy of the present Government and the indifference and apathy of so many organs of public opinion in this country.

The Government, at any rate, have no excuse today for not knowing what Islam and India want and why they want it; and if all but a small fraction of the people here are still ignorant about these matters, the fault must be laid at the door of the British Press, which, with rare exceptions, has encouraged 'judicious indifference' of the British nation.

We were not charged with carrying on any kind of negotiations with diplomats. Ours was a much simpler task; the task of explaining, as I have said, our religious obligations and the sentiments and views of our people, and showing how, in the result that we desire to secure, these requirements and these aspirations tallied with the result expected from any honest application of the principle of self-determination and with the redemption of the pledges so freely given at the commencement of the War and throughout its duration. From the very outset, we avoided everything in the nature of a threat, and more than one Minister of the Crown has borne testimony to our moderation But we were certainly charged to convey a warning to the Allies, a warning of the gravest consequences that were bound to follow the disregard by the Allied Governments of their own pledged word as well as the disregard of our religious obligations and of the demands of the principles of nationality and self-determination.

In spite of Mr. Lloyd George's denials, Islam and India and the East generally will consider the Peace made with Turkey to be no Peace at all, and, in fact, the end of all Peace in the East, and events are already speaking louder than any of us could speak or desire to speak. The British Government found itself at the end of this War in a position unparalleled in the past history of these Isles. All the Near East lay apparently at the mercy of Great Britain, for when Turkey concluded the Armistice. There was neither Russia nor Germany, nor of course, France and Italy, to thwart her wishes. Her enemies have been crushed, and her friends after their joint victory find that they depend upon her to-day far more than they could have expected when they entered into an Alliance with her. And such a large part of the East lies exposed today to British exploitation that I do not wonder Great Britain is assailed with a great temptation. But that temptation is not unattended with great risk. In fact, we came here to warn Great Britain that the risk was even greater than the temptation. But she has not heeded the warnings and we stand absolved of further responsibility for the consequences.

The Nationalists of Turkey, which means the entire Nation, but for a few whom Great Britain herself has thrust into power, will not surrender, unless the nature of the Turk has entirely changed for the worse, and every Mussulman in every part of the world will symphathise with the Turk for his last stand for his creed and his country.

Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine, the Arab regions that were to be rescued from 'Turkish Tyranny' are sharing their gratitude in the only manner in which it was possible for them to show it to such 'liberators'. They have certainly fallen from the frying pan into the fire, and today they regret

that the Turk rules no more over them. Sir Percy Cox has been sent to Mesopotamia and Sir Herbert Samuel is already in Palestine. But it is not thus that pacification of these regions will come. These clever gentlemen may be masters of tactics; but where the entire political strategy is wrong, no tactics could win the campaign. It is not to set up independent Arab States that these dignitaries has gone out to the East. It is only to subjugate them in the interests of foreign exploiters and imperialists. And if the Arab has not entirely lost his love of freedom, he will never consent to be enslaved. More than that, no Mussulman, whether Indian, Persian or Afghan, could consent to exercise of political control by non-Muslim over these regions. We ourselves are the mandatories of Allah, and can acknowledge no other mandate in Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine.

We have already seen the response of the Arab population. The response of India is no less clean even though it has not yet perhaps achieved the dignity of head-lines. On August 1 was inaugurated the programme of non-co-operation, and if the people in this country are wise, they would not be taken in by cables sent from India by correspondents of English newspapers. It was these very correspondents that only a couple of months ago were ridiculing the migration movement, a movement for which the Khilafat leaders had undertaken no responsibility because they intended to resort to migration only when all the stages of their programme of cessation of co-operation with Government had failed to persuade it to revise the Turkish Treaty. The migration movement was then ridiculed; but before many weeks were over, Indians had migrated not in tens nor hundreds, but in thousands; and if the movement had not grown so rapidly as to up set all the calculations of those who were making arrangements on both sides of the border for the comfort of the emigrants, more than 1,00,000 Indians would have already crossed the border. As it is, it was more than a week ago that 20,000 were known already to have walked out of the British Empire. No less than 7,000 reached the frontier on a single morning to shake off from their feet the dust of British subjection. Whatever may be said of other things, this one fact has got to be accepted, that precisely 300 years after the migration of the Pilgrim Fathers, 200 times their number have already left Britain's dominions in the East, preferring exile and every hardship rather than permit the outrage that is being committed on their conscience, and acquiesce without effective protest in the betrayal of the word Great Britain gave to India in the hour of her need.

The days of Empires are over, but the British Commonwealth could yet be built up if only the people of Great Britain would insist that this Commonwealth should be broad based on the people's will. The history of Ireland is before us. What would have satisfied Ireland five years, and even three years ago, does not satisfy her today. It is too late. India could yet be

induced to remain within the British Commonwealth; but to-morrow it may be too late.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, September 1920.

23

MOHAMED ALI ON 'THE SATYAGRAH'

And we, the slaves of India ! Doubtless they are going to ask us to go and make slaves of others in Mesopotamia, in order to safeguard the domination over India. But henceforth the Indians will see this clearly, and on August 1 next, when Damad Ferid Pasha, a British functionary, signs, or does not sign, the Treaty, India will manifest her resolve to cease all co-operation with the British Government. If the first warning is not heeded, the civil functionaries will send in their resignations. India, held by the sword, must then be also administered by the sword. This is to be a struggle solely moral, and one that will proceed by stages. The Government will have time for reflection. If that too does not prove sufficient, the third stage, the decisive stage, will be reached; the soldiers and the gendarmes will send their resignations, and it will be seen then if the English sword is strong enough and long enough to control India, Mesopotamia, Palestine and the vassals of Venizelos in Thrace and Smyrna .... To the sword we oppose our suffering and our calm and pacific will. We shall wait. To die for a cause is easy; we wish to live and suffer for it, and if the standard-bearers of the cause fall, the sacred cause will, nevertheless, continue to live.

The very names of our Movement symbolises it. It is 'Satyagraha', which means insistence (Agraha), on the truth (Satya). The Prophet himself used it in Mecca. And if this moral method of which the Mahatma (the great soul) Gandhi, who is not a Mussulman, is the exponent, does not suffice, our religion leaves us two other alternative methods of struggling against injustice: Holy War (Jehad), or emigration (Hijrat). While the former cannot be absent from her thoughts, India is already applying the latter, and the Amir of Afghanistan is receiving the emigrants and giving them lands.

Source : The Muslim Outlook, September 1920.

24

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY MR. M.A. JINNAH AT THE SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Calcutta, 7 September 1920

The All India Muslim League commenced it special sitting in Calcutta on the ground floor of the Town Hall at 9 O'clock on Tuesday morning. The hall was decorated with flags and foliage. Mr. M A. Jinnah, President of the League, occupied the chair. The attendance was very large, the hall being quite full. Three mottos spanned the breadth of the hall bearing in bold white letters on a red background the following inscriptions : 'Remember Jallianwala Bagh', 'Be true to your religion' and 'Liberty is man's birthright'. Among those on the platform were Mrs. Annie Besant, Mrs. Jinnah, Mrs. Yakub Hussain, Lala Lajpat Rai, Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Moti Lal Nehru, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Moulvi Zafar Ali Khan, Mr. Shaukat Ali, Moulana Karam Khan, Mr. Fazlul Huq, Mr. Erfan Ali, Swami Sradhananda, Mr. Ramamurti, Moulana Abul Kalam Azad, Mr. Rambhuj Dutt Chaudhuri, Mr. Duni Chand, Mr. C. Vijaya Raghavachariyar, Lala Girdhari Lal, Dr. S. Kitchlew, Syed Ali Nabi, Mr. Jamunadas Dwarkadas and Pandit Gokaran Nath Misser.

On either side of the presidential table stood a Khaki clad volunteer with drawn swords but to the evident relief of those nearest to them the swords were sheathed before the meeting began. The audience took exception to the flags of the Allies which, amongst others, flaunted in the hall. Mr. Shaukat Ali pointed out that the decorating of the hall was entrusted to a contractor who had hung these flags and the Secretary of the League being very busy had not noticed them, but after the morning session was over the flags in question would be removed.

The proceedings opened with a recitation from the Quran after which Hakim Moulana Abdul Rauf, Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the audience. He spoke in Urdu and after he had spoken for an hour and ten minutes he was asked to finish as it was getting late. The President, who was garlanded amidst cheers, then addressed the assembly.

PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH

Delegates of the Muslim League, ladies and gentlemen,

I have been called upon to preside over the special session of the Muslim League by virtue of its constitution which does not permit the election of a President except in the case of an annual session. The responsibility therefore of placing before you the grave aspects of the present situation has

fallen to me as the President of the League. I am not going to tire you with weary details. We have met here principally to consider the situation that has arisen owing to the studied and persistent policy of the Government since the signing of the Armistice. First came the Rowlatt Bill accompanied by the Punjab atrocities—and then came the spoilation of the Ottoman Empire (cries of shame) and the Khilafat. The one attacks our liberty, the other our faith. Now, every country has two principal and vital functions to perform—one to assert its voice in the international policy, and the other to maintain internally the highest ideals of justice and humanity. But one must have one's own administration in one's own hands (Hear, hear) to carry it on to one's own satisfaction. As we stand in matters international, India's voice is represented through His Majesty the King of England's Government, although nominally we happened to have two Indians who were supposed to represent us but they were neither the chosen nor the accredited representatives of India. The result was that notwithstanding the unanimous opinion of the Mussulmans, and in breach of the Prime Minister's solemn pledges, unchivalrous and outrageous terms have been imposed upon Turkey (Shame) and the Ottoman Empire has served for plunder and broken up by the Allies under the guise of Mandates. This, thank God, has at last convinced us, one and all, that we can no longer abide our trust either in the Government of India or in the Government of his Majesty the King of England (Applause) to represent India in matter international.

The Indian press is flooded by accounts of occurrences in the Colonies, which show but too well how India is sacrificed to the individual interests of these Englishmen who have settled in these Colonies which India's man-power and India's work-power have built.

And now let us turn to the Punjab. That Star Chamber Legislation named after the notorious Chairman of the Rowlatt Committee was launched by the Government of Lord Chelmsford, and it resulted in those 'celebrated crimes' which neither the words of men nor the tears of women can wash away. 'An error of judgment' they call it. If that is the last word, I agree with them, —an error of judgment it is—and they shall have to pay for it if not today then to-morrow (Hear, hear). One thing there is which is indisputable, and that is that this Government must go and give place to a complete responsible Government (Hear hear and applause). Meeting of the Congress and the Muslim League will not effect this. We shall have to think out some course, more effective than passing resolutions of disapproval to be forwarded to the Secretary of State for India. And we shall surely find a way even as France and Italy did—and the new born Egypt has. We are not going to rest content until we have attained the fullest political freedom in our own country (Hear, hear).

Mahatma Gandhi has placed his programme of Non-cooperation, supported by the authority of the Khilafat Conference before the country. It is now for you to consider whether or not you approve of its principle, and

approving of its principle whether or not you approve of its details. The operation of this scheme will strike at the individual in each of you, and therefore it rest with you alone to measure your strength and to weigh the pros and the cons of question before you arrive at a decision. But once you have decided to march let there be no retreat under any circumstances (No, no, never).

In the meanwhile there sits in Olympian Simla a self-satisfied Viceroy who alternately offers his sympathies to us unfortunate Mussulmans, and regrets Mahatma Gandhi's 'foolish of all foolish scheme' (Shame) being fortified with a 'character' from His Majesty's Government sent in a recent Despatch from 'Home'—the word Home is in inverted commas. This is the 'changed angle of vision' on which we heard such high sounding phrases during those critical stages of the war when Indian gold was sought and unfortunately given-given, to break Turkey and buy the fetters of the Rowlatt Legislation.

One degrading measure upon another, disappointment upon disappointment, and injury upon injury, can lead a people to only one end. It led Russia to Bolshevism. It has led Ireland to Sinn Feinism. May it lead India to Freedom (Applause).

The unsatisfactory character of the 'Reforms' evolved by the timidity of Mr. Montague and the prejudice of Lord Chelmsford marred by its own Rules and Regulations, and worked under the influence of Lord Chelmsford's Government offers us 'license for liberty, and license does not compensate for liberty' and if I may quote here the words of a well-known author this what he says 'license for liberty and license does not compensate for liberty.' We may have Indians as Lieutenant-Governors and Governors and for the matter of the Viceroys. That is license but that is not liberty (Hear, hear). What we want is true political freedom of the people and no posts and positions in Government (Applause). And, secondly, the unusual haste displayed in the passing of the Rowlatt Act before the new Council and contrary to the universal opinion, only go to illustrate the policy of the Government. And when in the Punjab this universal opposition against the Rowlatt Act manifested itself through constitutional methods, it fell to the lot of the Lieutenant Governor to dishonestly characterise it as 'open rebellion.' Only his administrative genius could have conjured up a vision of 'open rebellion' in a country whose people have been brutally unarmed and only his cowardly spirit could have requisitioned the application of Martial Law secure in his knowledge that weaponless there could be no retaliation (Shame). Martial law was introduced; the manner and circumstances of its proclamation and its administration was calculated to destroy political freedom, political life, not only in the Punjab but throughout India by striking terror into the hearts of its people. The majority report of the Hunter Committee is one more flagrant and disgraceful instance that there can be no justice when there is conflict between an Englishman and an Indian.

The Government of India with its keen sense of humour and characteristic modesty proceeds to forward a resolution in its Despatch to the Secretary of State commending its conduct, blind to the fact that they were in the position of an accused passing judgment.

Now, let us turn to the great 'error of judgment'—the judicious finding of the Cabinet—which itself is no less an error of judgment and that was duly wired to us by Reuter. To follow up events in sequence I must mention the Parliamentary debate which forgot the Punjab and discussed General Dyer, of course Mr. Montague hadn't the time to put India's case before the House, being far too busy offering personal explanations. And then the blue and brainless blood of England, to their crowning glory, carried the infamous resolution of Lord Finlay.

And what of the sacred land of the Crescent and Star and the blue and golden Bosphorus, its capital seized and the Khalifa virtually made a prisoner, its territories overrun by Allied Troops groaming under an imposition of impossible terms. It is a death warrant and not a treaty.

There are the enormities crying aloud and we have met to-day face to face with a dangerous and most unprecedented situation. The solution is not easy and the difficulties are great. But I cannot ask the people to submit to wrong after wrong. Yet I would still ask the Government not to drive the people of India to desperation or else there is no other course left open to the people except to inaugurate the policy of non-cooperation (Hear, hear and applause) though not necessarily the programme of Mr. Gandhi (No, no).

I do not wish to detain you any more but before I sit down I will only say this, remember that united we stand, divided we fall (Hear, hear and applause), and throughout your discussion I beg of you not to lose sight of that. I am certain that every member of the Muslim League will rise to that high sense of duty which he owes to his community and his country and in the course of your deliberations and discussion whatever the differences of opinion may be—we must give credit to each other that each in his own way is doing his best for his motherland and for his home and for his country. Is that spirit I would urge upon you to proceed with your deliberations and I have no doubt that the collective wisdom, the united wisdom, of the best intellect of the Mussulmans will not fail to find a solution of a question which we consider from a purely Mussulman point of view as a matter of life and death, namely, the Khilafat question. I have no doubt that with over seventy millions of Mussulmans led by the best intellect and brains of the community, success is assured (Hear, hear and applause).

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

25

NON-COOPERATION : MAHATMA GANDHI'S LETTER TO VICEROY RENOUNCING MEDALS

16 September 1920

It is not without a pang that I return the Kaisir-i-Hind Gold Medal granted to me by your predecessor for my humanitarian work in South Africa, the Zulu War Medal granted in South Africa for my services as officer-in-charge of Indian Volunteer Ambulance Corps in 1906, and the Boer War Medal for my services as Assistant Superintendent of Indian Volunteer Stretcher Bearer Corps during the Boer War of 1899–1900. I venture to return those medals in pursuance of the scheme of non-cooperation inaugurated today in connection with the Khilafat movement. Valuable as these honours have been to me, I cannot wear them with an easy conscience so long as my Mussulman countrymen have to labour under the wrong done to their religious sentiment. Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral and unjust manner, and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality. I can retain neither respect nor affection for such a Government. The attitude of the Imperial and your Excellency's Governments in the Punjab question has given me additional cause for grave dissatisfaction. I had the honour, as your Excellency is aware, as one of the Congress Commissioners to investigate the causes of disorders in the Punjab during April of 1919, and it is my deliberate conviction that Sir Michael O'Dwyer was totally unfit to hold the office of Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab and that his policy was primarily responsible for infuriating the mob at Amritsar. No doubt the mob excesses were unpardonable. In cendiarism, murder of five innocent Englishmen, and the cowardly assault on Miss Sherwood were most deplorable and uncalled for, but the punitive measures taken by General Dyer, Colonel Frank Johnson, Colonel O'Breien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Rai Shri Ram Sud, Mr. Malik Khan and other officers were out of all proportion to the crime of the people and amounted to wanton cruelty and inhumanity almost unparalleled in modern times. Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Mr. Montague's Despatch and, callous disregard of feeling betrayed by the House of Lords have filled me with gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government, and have disabled me from tendering, as I have hitherto whole-heartedly tendered, my loyal cooperation. In my humble opinion, the ordinary method of agitating by way of petitions, deputations and the like is no remedy for moving to repentance a Government so

hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved itself to be. In European countries such grievous wrongs as the Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted at all cost national emasculation such as the said wrongs imply, but half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have ventured to suggest the remedy of non-cooperation, which enables those who wish to disassociate themselves from Government and which, if it is unattended by violence and undertaken in an ordered manner, must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed. But, whilst I shall pursue the policy of non-cooperation in so far as I can carry the people with me, I shall not lose hope that you will yet see your way to do justice. I therefore respectfully ask Your Excellency to summon a conference of recognised leaders of the people, and in consultation with them find a way that would placate the Mussulmans and do reparation to unhappy Punjab.

Source : **The Muslim Outlook, September 1920.**

26

BANARAS UNIVERSITY AND NON-COOPERATION

Mahatma Gandhi's visit to Banaras and his mischievous attempt to wreck the Hindu University have been a total failure .... There has not been any withdrawal yet, and if there are any withdrawals at all, it will be less than 60 out of a total strength of about 1,600 students in the various colleges of the University. There has not been any interruption to the work of the college, and the lectures are being held in the usual manner .... The members of the staff, with one exception, have presented solid opposition against Mr. Gandhi and his doctrine of non-cooperation. The dissentient individual is a certain Mr. Kripalani, who is a disciple of Mr. Gandhi, and his former Private Secretary. He has resigned his appointment which has been accepted by the authorities.

The Members of staff criticised in unmistakable language several aspects of Gandhi's programme of non-cooperation. It was made clear to Gandhi that the opposition to this movement proceeded not from any want of courage on the part of responsible educationalists but from their strong and unshakeable conviction that the best interests of the country would not be served by any sacrifice of the intellectual progress and discipline for which the educational institutions stand.

Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya, V. C. of Banaras Hindu University expressed his sorrow for those 60 students who were intending to join the Mahatma. He would naturally be sorry to part with even one student and he expressed a wish that the students in question should see him before deciding upon the final step.

Source: The Pioneer, December 1920.

27

THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY AT ALIGARH

Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali Brothers visited Aligarh on the 12 October in the course of their tour in upper India preaching Non-cooperation, especially withdrawal of students from College and lawyers from practice. A strong undercurrent of unrest amongst the student population was swaying their college life and Principal Ziauddin tried to induce the visitors to refrain from inflaming the students. On the 12 October the students held a mass meeting in their Union Club and invited Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali Brothers to deliver addresses on the present situation. Non-cooperation was preached and the cry was at once taken up. The boys did not attend college from this day and instead held several political meetings. The situation was becoming alarming day by day, as there was free talk of converting the College into a national University; in panic the Principal sent wires to the authorities, to the Police, to the Trustees and the parents, complaining that he was unable to cope with the new rush of developments. The non-cooperation leaders presented an ultimatum to the Secretary and the Principal on the 12 October as follows.

STATEMENT OF NON-COOPERATION LEADERS

In view of the open hostility shown by Great Britain to Islam in the treaty forced upon Turkey, the destruction of the sacred Islamic institution of the Khilafat is attempted therein and the continued occupation of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the non-cooperation Committee of the All India Khilafat Conference has decided that all educational institutions which are either carried on or in any way controlled by Government or which receive its aid must be boycotted and all students and teachers must be withdrawn from them. The All India Muslim League and the Indian National Congress have also passed similar resolutions at their special sessions recently held at Calcutta. We feel certain that in the existing circumstances it must be as repugnant to our colleagues on Board of Trustees of the M.A.O.College and of the Muslim University Association as it is to us to receive any financial aid for those

institutions from or permit and kind of interference therein by Government which has so contemptuously disregarded our religious obligations and national sentiments and so unscrupulously betrayed its own repeated pledged word. We therefore call upon you and the other Trustees of the M.A.O.College and members of the Muslim University Association to refuse henceforth to receive any aid from Government or to permit any kind or sort of Government interference whether directly or indirectly through the Allahabad University or any other agency in these institutions. We desire to inform you and our other colleagues that we are also calling upon the teachers and adult students at Aligarh to withdraw themselves and upon the guardians of other students to withdraw their wards from the college and school on the 29 October 1920, in the event of the Trustees, refusal to comply with these obvious requirements of the Islamic faith. We therefore, request you with all earnestness at our command to take the action we recommend at the earliest possible date and to treat this matter as of the greatest possible urgency. We remain yours most obediently — (1) H. M. Ajmal Khan, (2) M. A. Ansari, (3) Moazam Ali Khan, (4) Zahoor Ahmad, (5) Shaukat Ali (Khadim Kaba), (6) Mohamad Ali (Khadim Kaba), (7) N. Ismail Khan, (8) H. M. Musa Khan, and (9) A. Mustafa Khan.

Meanwhile students from all over India addressed congratulatory letters to their fellow students at Aligarh; the eyes of the whole student population were on them. And on 21 October the College Khilafat Committee issued the following appeal to the students of India.

APPEAL OF COLLEGE KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

Fellow students, You are not unconscious of the grave responsibilities which have fallen upon our shoulder in effecting the reconstruction of tomorrow, India's soul is revolting against humiliations and insults offered to her every day. The time is gone by when our country used to bow low before the blast in patient and deep disdain. The sacrilege committed against the Khilafat, the degradation and humiliation to which our countrymen have been subjected to in Punjab, the brutal and most inhuman treatment meted out to our brethren in Turkey, Syria, Mesopotamia and various other countries in the Middle East, and the unjust and shameful treaty forced on Turkey by nations actuated by Imperialistic motives of territorial aggrandizement, have forced us to rise in indignation against the perpetrators of such unparalleled crimes in the history of the world. Non-cooperation is the only effective weapon to bring into reality the vision of free India—India with freedom to think and freedom to act. Our national self-respect can no more tolerate cooperation with a Government which is impervious alike to feeling and reason and which is daily forging a new chain round our necks. In the name of all that is best and noblest in the heart of man, we appeal to you to join us in our just cause and sacrifice time, toil and talent to bring this struggle to a successful issue, for freedom's battle once begun, though baffled off, is ever won.

In the meantime the College was closed, outsiders were warned not to preach to the boys who were asked to leave the College and hostel for their homes, parents were wired to, and a meeting of the Trustees was called.

Mr. Mohamed Ali, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Abul Kalam Azad and Moulvi Abdul Majid of Meerut arrived in Aligarh on the 23rd and delivered lectures in the college mosque. They said that a National organisation would be announced on 29th October after Jumma prayers. Mr. Mohamed Ali himself would be the first Principal for a short period. They would take possession of the college building and advised the students not to leave the college till carried away forcibly on shoulders.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S LETTER

On October 24 Mahatma Gandhi addressed the following letter to the Trustees from Bombay.

'I know you are about to meet in order to give your decision on the most momentous issue for Islam and India. I hear you are calling in the aid of the Government or the police for the occasion of your meeting. If rumour is true, you would be making an obvious mistake, in a matter which is purely domestic you need neither the intervention of the Government nor the protection of its police. Neither the Ali Brothers nor myself are engaged in brute war. We are engaged in a war in which our only weapon is the force of the public opinion. We shall reckon ourselves beaten in the battle if we do not carry the public with us. In the present dispute the test of public opinion will be in the first instance your majority. Therefore, if you after full and free discussion decide by a majority that the college and school boys may not remain in the college ground either as students or even as boarders if they persist in their demand for disaffiliation and rejection of Government grant, they will be peacefully withdrawn. I propose in that event to carry on their education, if at all possible in Aligarh itself, otherwise elsewhere. Our desire is not to suspend their secular education for one moment longer than is absolutely necessary. But it is our desire that it should be given in consistance with the law of Islam and honour of India. I understand that in the opinion of recognised Ulemas it is not lawful for a believing Muslim to receive assistance of or give assistance to government that has directly or indirectly sought to cause destruction of the holy Khilafat or tamper with the exclusive control of Jazirat-ul-Arab. You know, as well as I do, how this Government has wilfully trampled under foot Indian honour. Consistently, therefore, with the control of their passions all voluntary association with Government is being withdrawn by the people. The least that you, in my humble opinion, can do is to decline any further Government grant, to disaffiliate the great institution of which you are trustees and to reject the charter of the Muslim University. The least the Aligarh boys can do if you fail to respond to the call of Islam and India is to wash their hands clean off the institution acknowledging the aegies of Government that has forfeited all title to allegiance of Islam and India and

bring into being a larger, nobler and purer Aligarh that would carry out the innermost wishes of its great founder. I cannot imagine the late illustrious Sir Syed Ahmed keeping his nobler creation under the control or influence of the present Government. As I have been the originator of the idea of disaffiliation of Aligarh and rejection of Government grant I feel I might be able to assist you in your discussion and therefore offer my humble services to you and will gladly attend your meeting if you will allow me to do so. I am at Bombay and shall await your answer, but whether you wish me to attend or not I hope you will not summon Government intervention in purely domestic matter, and let me say to Government through you that one hears all sorts of rumours of their intentions about Ali Brothers and myself. I hope for the sake of peaceful evolution of struggle that they will not restrict our liberty. We are endeavouring in the most constitutional manner to conduct our propaganda. We are seeking to bend Government to the people's will for it will not overthrow it by brute force but by creating public opinion. We hold it to be perfectly constitutional, legitimate and honourable to expose the satanic nature of Government and ask the people by appealing to their heads and their hearts and never to their animal passion, to express their will not in word but in action, *i.e.* by withdrawing all possible association with Government. But if Government wish even to suppress liberty of opinion and peaceful action I hope they will not issue internment orders against us, for in spite of our sincere desire not to offer civil disobedience even in our own persons, it will not be possible for us to respect any internment orders so long as our movement be not physically restrained. We must use it in such a manner as we consider to be the best in the interest of our mission.'

In reply the Secretary, M.A.O. College sent the following wire to Mahatma Gandhi :

Thanks for your letter. Regret cannot invite you to the meeting on the 27th which is purely a Trustees' consultation meeting. We firmly and strongly adhere to our old established policy and sincerely wish to uphold it peacefully. Rumour that assistance of Police and Government is being invoked for our meeting or against any body is absolutely false and groundless.

DRAMA AT A. M. U.

What followed next amidst the tumultuous uproar of the students is given in the following account published by the Secretary of the Aligarh College :

'Mr. Mohamed Ali at last withdrew himself with the students who had defied all orders of the Principal on the morning of the 31 October when the District Magistrate Mr. Campbell very politely asked him not to involve the students in trouble. The total number of Trustees at present is 124 of whom 62 Trustees attended the meeting the 27 October in person while 28 sent a message as condemning the action of the Ali Brothers and their associates. Only two Trustees sent message supporting their action. The meeting lasted all day. It had been called as an emergency meeting though not specifically

provided for in the rules, as Mr. Shaukat Ali and his friends demanded a decision by the 29 October.

'The meeting lasted all day. Since that meeting the Trustees and Syndicate have sat daily, sometimes sitting from 6 to 11 p.m., and discussed the situation and ways and means of getting Mr. Mohamed Ali and his friends to withdraw themselves and the students who had refused to go to their homes from the college premises. But all attempts had failed. Individual Trustees of high social standing had also approached Dr. Ansari and Hakim Ajmal Khan but with no better success. Though these two gentlemen said that they were going to vacate the college premises on 1 November or thereabout they would give no definite undertaking in writing. While the Trustees were trying to act with every consideration and were anxious to avoid any coercion or force, Mr. Mohamed Ali had openly declared that he had no intention of moving or opening a separate national college or universty; his object being to purify this very college. He had also collected the students with few exceptions into the main quadrangle, some rooms of which were forced open. It was reported that he intended to break open some lecture rooms and take forcible possession of Principal's office. He started making admission of students in his so-called national college by swearing each student on the Holy Quran. It was reported that Mr. Mohomed Ali was about to be joined by his brother and a staff of professors and that students of other colleges who had struck were coming to his national college. The situation was hourly getting more serious and it was felt by all that if action had to be taken it must be taken immediately or never. The Trustees could not take the law into their own hands and bodily eject Mr. Mohamed Ali or the students. They therefore, had to seek the protection of the civil authorities and it was decided by the Syndicate at 8 p.m. on the 30th that the District authorities should be approached. Accordingly the Honorary Secretary acting under the instruction of the Syndicate applied to the District Magistrate to deal with the situation in the best way he could. The District Magistrate made arrangements to prevent outsiders from coming into the college grounds and to protect the college buildings and properties against damage. At 5.30 a.m., on the 31st the men of civil police without arms with a few men of the armed police were posted round Sir Syed Court, as the main quadrangle of the College Boarding House is called, in which the great bulk of the students were living, while some men of armed police were posted round the Old Boys Lodge situated in the college grounds in which Mr. Mohamed Ali and some of his friends were living at the time.

The District Magistrate Mr. Campbell accompanied by the Hony. Secretary arrived at the Old Boys' Lodge and found Mr. Mohamed Ali and his friends standing in the verandah. Mr. Campbell spoke courteously and appologised for disturbing them so early. After a few minutes conversation Mr. Mohamed Ali expressed his willingness to advise the students to withdraw peacefully. The District Magistrate and the Hony. Secretary came out leaving

Mr. Mohamed Ali and his friends to perform their morning prayers for which 45 minutes were asked. After this interval Mr. Mohamed Ali and his friends came out and expressed their intention of going to the college mosque for their morning prayers. The District Magistrate remained outside the mosque gate while Mr. Mohamed Ali and his friends and a few students who had come out of their rooms went into the mosque to say their morning prayers. Before Mr. Mohamed Ali entered the mosque Mr. Campbell asked him not to make a speech or address the students in the mosque whereupon Mr. Mohamed Ali told Mr. Campbell that the mosque was intended to be used only for prayers and not for any other purpose. After saying his prayers Mr. Mohamed Ali came out and at the request of the District Magistrate told the students to withdraw peacefully. The students then went off to pack up and by half past noon the students and their belongings had been carried in motor lorries and other conveyances provided by the District Magistrate into the bungalows outside the college grounds and separated by a road only from the Minto Circle in which the schools are located. Some tents had also been pitched in the compound of these bungalows. After half past twelve the students assembled in the cricket lawn opposite the Old Boys' Lodge carrying a green flag and with Mr. Mohamed Ali marched to their new abode with cries of Allah-o-Akabar, Mr. Ali asking permission of the District Magistrate to return to the Old Boys' Lodge for his mid-day dinner. This closed the most disagreeable chapter in the proceedings and immediate danger was averted, but the real danger has yet to come and this is only the beginning of our troubles. The number of students who inspite of the Principal's order to leave the college premises remained in the boarding house was about one hundred or so. Since leaving college premises Mr. Mohamed Ali and the students withdrawn by him are living in two or three houses and tents not far from the college and separated from the Minto Circle by a road only, Mr. Shaukat Ali has since joined them, Mr. Mohamed Ali is said to have announced in very clear terms that he has no intention of starting any educational institution and has shown by his deeds and words that his sole object is to capture the impressionable youths and keep them together and train them as religious fanatics for purpose of his propaganda which is nothing short of revolutionary. Such being the attitude and object of Mr. Mohamed Ali and his associates the most serious question before the Trustees is whether the college can ever be opened again. As long as the centre of Mohamed Ali's activities remains in such close proximity to the college, it will be impossible to carry on the work of the college for a day and parents will not sent their sons knowing that we should be powerless to protect them against the baneful menace at our very door for Mr. Mohamed Ali when asking the students to peacefully withdraw from the college said that the withdrawal was only temporary as he intended to bring them back before long. He has on more than one occasion repeated his intention of returning to the college some day and converting it into his National College as in his opinion the present Trustees by their refusal to

listen to the commands of God through Mr. Mohamed Ali's mouth have forfeited the right to remain Trustees.'

INAUGURATION OF NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

The following account was supplied by Maulana Mohamed Ali, Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari who wired from Aligarh on 29 October 1920.

About sixty trustees of the Aligarh College assembled at the private residence of the Hon. Nawab Khan Bahadur Muzammil Ullah Khan, Vice-President, Board of Trustees, on the 27th when he commenced proceedings by taking the chair himself. Objection was taken to this on grounds that since the meeting was not of a character of the meeting provided for in the rules of the trustees and therefore irregular, the Vice-President was not entitled to assume the chair without election by those present. He thereupon vacated the chair but after some noisy and confused discussion again took the chair probably as a result of some sort of election.

The proceedings were finally commenced with the reading of the report by the Honorary Secretary, the accuracy of which was several times challenged.

The Chairman promised an opportunity would be provided for the discussion of it after it had been read, but was disinclined to do so when he had to be sharply pulled up by several trustees and reminded of his undertaking. In the course of the Secretary's reading of the report which dwelt repeatedly and at considerable length on Mahatma Gandhi and Ali brothers in contravention of the terms of the 9 trustees own letter calling upon the students to take certain action in the event the trustees did not reject Government aid and dispense with affiliation to Government controlled Universities. Mr. Mohamed Ali protested against the grossly incorrect translation of that letter in the Secretary's report and pointed out that in the original letter which he had himself framed it was clearly stated that they were also calling upon adult students, parents of others and the staff to take certain action if the trustees failed to adopt the course the signatories of the letter had recommended. He therefore insisted on the original letter and not a garbled version of it being read which after some confused opposition was done.

Dr. Ansari asked the Secretary whether invitation to the meeting of information thereof had been sent to all the trustees or only to particular trustees selected by the Secretary whom he desired to attend to which the later replied that he deliberately excluded the nine trustees who give up Government aid and disaffiliate the college because he considered their proposal was to raise the College to the ground. This elicited numerous protests and one of the trustees pointed out he was not among the nine signatories; he had not declared hitherto in favour of Non-cooperation, though he generally worked with the signatories; but he too had received no invitation. Although living in Aligarh and although he was a Syndic of the college and lived in Aligarh and was mostly in the town he received no notice of the

numerous meetings of the Syndicate held since the receipt of the nine trustees' letter. Amidst much confusion the Chairman declared he considered the Secretary's and Syndicate's decision improper, and advised him to invite all and telegrams had been sent on the previous day to those who had been excluded. The Secretary, however, declared that although he had carried out the Vice-President's wish he himself still maintained that his action was proper. Dr. Naziruddin Hassan proposed that the meeting although informal and consultative should declare the Secretary's action improper and direct him not to pick and choose which trustees should be invited and which not invited to any meeting of trustees as whether regular or informal, but invite all as had always been done before. The Hon. Riza Ali pointed out under the existing rules signatories were fully entitled to invitation and participation in the meeting but said to all intents the doctrine of 'factum valet' applied, but Maulana Mohamed Ali pointed out that telegrams were sent only on the previous day and were clearly insufficient notice to some signatories who like his brothers and others were at Bombay or other distant places and could not reach Aligarh in time even if the telegrams could have reached them which he doubted.

After Friday Service the inauguration ceremony of the Muslim University took place in the College Mosque. Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Mohamed Ali, the Principal, Mr. Khwaja and other leaders of the movement, escorted Maulana Mahmood Hassan Saheb of Deoband from Mr. Khwaja's residence to the Mosque. Maulana's health had been very seriously impaired, and he had fever every day which confined him to bed for a long time. In a short but movingly eloquent speech Hakim Ajmal Khan proposed Maulana Mahmood Hasan Sahib to preside and feelingly described the heroic self-sacrifices and constancy of the Maulana who had upheld in holy Mecca, where he had been arrested for being true to his faith and finally in him long continued exile in Malta, the great traditions of Moslems of the earliest and most glorious period of Islam.

Haji Moosa Khan, a local trustee of the College, cordially seconded the motion which was acclaimed by the whole assembly with impressive enthusiasm. A fatwa was read that in a matter of their faith students were not only justified in not obeying orders of their parents and guardians, if those orders were opposed to the Islamic doctrines, but that it was the students' duty to appeal to the latter in a respectful manner to adopt the same course as they had done.

A special feature of the augural address was an exposition of the attitude which the Maulana and his religious preceptors at Deoband had taken up with regard to western education and Aligarh College in the past and of the terms on which religious and secular education were to be reconciled in accordance with Islamic doctrine.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1921.

28

RESOLUTION MOVED BY MAULANA SHAUKAT ALI AT THE MORADABAD PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE REGARDING THE BOYCOTT OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

11 October 1920

This Conference appeals to the authorities of the Mahommedan College, Aligarh, and the Muslim and Hindu Universities to forego all monetary or other aid that they are receiving from Government and to sever their relations with Government. This Conference strongly urges the Managing Committees of schools and colleges to give up Government aid and connection soon so as to act upon the Congress resolution regarding withdrawal of students from schools and colleges in connection with non-cooperation. This Conference specially invites Municipal Committees and District Boards to act on this resolution.

In moving the above resolution Mr. Shaukat Ali spoke as follows :

Brothers and Sisters—I have to leave for Aligarh in five minutes so that, with God's help, I may reduce into practice the resolution I am placing before you and may show to the world that Muslims at least will not tolerate the ridicule of Islam. Brethren, I would tell you in five minutes what my object is; I would say nothing about the Hindu University. My brother Mr. Shiva Prasad Gupta will speak to you about it. But I have a right to speak about the Muslim University. Brethern, I am not boasting, I do not mean to impose on you. It is a true fact of which you might be aware that when I was a Government servant I took leave for a year and a half and collected 21 lakhs of rupees with my own hand for this Muslim University. You know that I love every inch of the ground of Aligarh. Whatever comfort and ease I have enjoyed in this world up till now is due to Aligarh. My children are reading today in Aligarh and in the future also I hope that our coming generations will receive their education in Aligarh. Today I have stood up. I love Aligarh so much, I trust that it will be through Aligarh that Islam will be served in India. Today I say that it is the duty of Aligarh that the Muslim College and University should tear up its charter and make it over to Government.

Brethren, the Aligarh College and Muslim University were established so that Muslims may win renown in the world by becoming Muslims. Today Islam demands of us a test of our faiths. I desire most gladly that my Aligarh should stand the first test. We have no connection with this Government which has proved itself to be the enemy of God and His Prophet and the enemy of our Holy Places. Neither are we its subjects, nor it is our ruler. We should throw its money towards it today, I am going today to Aligarh

and I hope that College which has made a great difference in Islam and Muslim life in India and which has enabled Indian Muslims to take a prominent part in Congresses and Conferences now—that College of mine will render another great service to its God and His Prophet and that service would be to return in God's name the grant of one lakh of rupees received from Government saying that that money was tainted and it did not require it. If the Trustees do not return this money I would appeal to our brethren, to our children to empty the College.

By God, when we take out these one thousand or twelve hundred students from the Aligarh College and send them out in God's name into the world to serve the Khilafat and to preserve the liberty of the country, I assure you (I am an educational expert and there is none in this room who is a greater friend of education than myself) I will give such education to our children that they will be benefited both in this world and the next.

Brethren, I have not much to say. Today when this proposal was put forward my revered (friend) Pandit Moti Lal, who is present here, said to me 'Shaukat Ali, if the Aligarh College is emptied, and if Muslims tear the charter paper of the Muslim University, and return it to Government, you should first make your will here.' I replied : 'Eight years ago, the very day I joined the Khuddam-i-Kaaba and took an oath to sacrifice my life and property for Islam, that very day I made my will. There is a couplet by Hali :

O Hali I was afraid of death neither then nor am I now.
There was only a slight bashfulness and that is disappearing.

My friend was telling me last night that the Collector of his district held the view that I was behind the man who had killed a Deputy Commissioner at Kheri and that I should be implicated and he mentioned my honoured name. Instead of being afraid or being terrified with the thought of the hangman's rope, God be thanked, I laughed and recollected a couplet. It is different if you accuse any one of any crime with falsehood and deceit. But God knows and the Government also knows that if Mahatma Gandhi and myself had not today been the leaders and rulers of the entire Muslim community then not only one but a thousand Deputy Commissioners of theirs would have been killed. Now I recite a couplet and close my speech :

Whenever a new trouble arises in this world,
He points the finger towards my grave.

My heart is gladdened and I recite the second couplet :

O innocent idol, May God grant years to thee
May God bring the day when thou mayest be fit to practice tyranny.

Source : Home Department, Political, January 1921, F. No. 5.

29

ON HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

3 October 1920

We referred in the recent issue to the advantageous way in which the Ramlila processions were used to promote inter-communal unity....... In Nainital, Mahommedans garlanded Ram, Lakshman and Sita in the Ramlila procession and there was naturally great cordiality of feeling between the followers of the two religions. Similarly during Mahorram, prominent Hindus distributed pan, tea and cigarettes to the Mahommedans. We hope such will soon be the fashionable and the right thing to do. If the practice is encouraged there will be no occasion for Hindu-Moslem quarrels and the Bureaucracy will have one argument less for its continuance.

Source: **The Independent, Allahabad, October 1920.**

30

THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. M. A. ANSARI

Nagpur, 30 December 1920

Dr. M. A. Ansari, the President of the thirteenth session of the All India Muslim League held at Nagpur on the 30th instant delivered a lengthy speech in the course of which he expressed sympathy with the sufferings of Ireland and Egypt and discussed the question of the Khilafat threadbare. The devices of the Allied Government the treaty of Severes, the Turkish treaty, the effect of the treaty on the Muslim world—all these questions were dwelt upon at considerable length. He also discussed the Khilafat Delegation's work in various allied countries in Europe. He dwelt upon the Punjab question, severely criticised the Despatch of the Government of India. He then discussed the non-cooperation movement.

PROGRESSIVE NON-VIOLENT NON-COOPERATION

The Khilafat and the Punjab questions naturally bring one to the consideration of the methods by which these wrongs should be redressed and

their repetition made impossible. It is not only the question of Khilafat or the Punjab, the repressive legislation or the shameful treatment of Indians in different parts of the British Empire, but it is the spirit behind these individual actions which has to be fought and conquered. To any one who tries to look deeper it becomes obvious that these specific actions are the natural outcome of the notion of superiority of the West over the East, the greed and lust of power, the desire of exploitation of the weaker nations for the benefit of stronger, and the determination on the part of the Western nations to perpetuate the bondage and slavery of Asiatic people. It is, therefore, not only a question of India's honour and freedom but a great struggle for the emancipation of all the enslaved Asiatic people from the thraldom of the West. In the foregoing observations I have endeavoured to show that all the talk about liberation of the weaker nations from oppressive yoke, the right to freedom of subject nationalities and the principle of self-determination indulged in by the Allied statesmen, have been a delusion and a snare. The question then arises whether we in India are going to undo our wrongs, or are we going to continue the old policy of mendicancy, petitioning others to grant us our inherent rights.

So far as the Mussulmans are concerned the principle of non-cooperation is not a new idea; rather it is a clear and definite injunction of the Divine Shariat which the Mussulmans of India had in their forgetfulness consigned to oblivion. At the commencement, some members of the Khilafat Committee and some of the leading Muslim divines brought this matter before the public and when the question was carefully discussed as regards the application of this principle, it was decided that the present times furnish all the circumstances and the conditions laid down in the Muslim Shariat. It has therefore become binding that we should practise non-cooperation against the opponents of Islam.

Mahatma Gandhi's far-sighted mind saw in this Muslim religious principle an effective method of wide application, well suited for the present political requirements of the country and entirely in conformity with the principle of Satyagraha. His whole-hearted and single-minded advocacy of this principle resulted in its adoption by all the great political organisations representing the views of the over whelming majority of the inhabitants of this country. Non-cooperation is based on the obvious truth that no Government can carry on the administration of a country without the active cooperation or passive acquiescence of the people inhabiting that country. And if the Government of the country be unjust and heedless of the rights and liberties of the people the only peaceful way of reforming the recalcitrant government is to cease cooperation with it.

The consideration of this principle from the ethical point of view need not detain us very long. In order to have any wrong done to a people redressed it is not enough that a few individuals should be cognisant of the wrong but the entire people or at least a large majority of them must feel the

wrong. Then again the mere fact of feeling a wrong does not absolve you from your moral duty but you must deny to help the wrong doer in perpetuating the wrong, and by creating a very strong public opinion you must make the repetition of that wrong impossible.

As regards the religious aspect of this principle I shall only discuss it briefly from the Muslim point of view. The Muslim Shariat enjoins Tark-i-Mawalat or the abandonment of friendship (which means no connection of love, service or help) with those non-Muslims, who are enemies at war with Islam and Muslim countries. Again the Holy Quran imperatively demands that Mussulmans should behave righteously, affectionately and in a friendly manner towards all those non-Muslims who are neither at war with Muslims nor are they assailants intending to invade or occupy their territories. 'Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of (your) religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly, surely; Allah loves the doers of justice. Allah only forbids you respecting those who made war upon you on account of (your) religion, and drove you forth from your homes and backed up (others) in your expulsion, that you make friends with them and whoever makes friends with them : these are the unjust.' (60 : 8·9) and Allah says : Oh you who believe ! Do not take my enemy and your enemy for friends. Would you offer them love while they deny what has come to you of the truth ? (Quran-i-Majid, Sur-i-Mumtaheua 60·1).

It is not necessary to lay stress on the fact that Non-cooperation is not only a political or a moral necessity but to a Mussulman it is a religious obligation and hence a graver responsibility attaches to him in carrying it out.

SURVEY OF PROGRESS

A brief survey of the progress of Non-cooperation during the last 3 months would be helpful in forming an estimate of its widespread acceptence and steady manner in which it is spreading.

The boycott of Councils by the Nationalists has been complete. The electors have also given a very clear verdict against the so-called Reformed Councils. The exact figures are not yet available, only rough estimate can be made. In a vast majority of the constituencies the percentage of electors who recorded their votes was about 10, in a small number between 10 and 25, and only a few above 25. No amount of explanation would convince the world that so far as the people of India are concerned they would care to have anything to do with the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms.

The response which the young people of India have given has been very substantial and most encouraging and this inspite of the difficulties and obstacles which have been placed in their way by the educational staff and authorities.

I cannot help feeling proud of the fact that the students of the Mahommedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, gave a lead in this matter. You have

all heard how that august assembly of the Trustees of the M.A.O. College gathered in an informal meeting at Aligarh, gave scant hearing to the call of their religion in which was also involved the cause of their country's honour and freedom. You know how the feeble voice of those who invited them as a matter of conscience to give up government grant-in-aid, to disaffiliate their College from the Government University and to nationalize it fell on deaf-ears. You are aware in what insolent and overbearing manner the Government-bidden packed majority rejected our demand and condemned our action. Then followed the insufferable high-handedness of the College authorities who stopped the food, water-supply, sanitary arrangements and medical aid of the non-cooperating students. And lastly the culminating act of the infuriated, panic-stricken authorities was to turn out the students from the College with the help of the Police-force.

All the while intimidation, persuasion, social and moral pressure were being brought to bear on these students. But they stood firm and behaved with marvellous patience and fortitude and left the College peacefully and quietly to take their abode in the new quarters of the National Muslim University. Ever since then a campaign of calumuies and vilification has been deliberately carried on against the Principal, his supporters, and the students of the new institution. The Aligarh College authorities have descended in their rage to the lowest depth and have thrown away all deceny and decorum to the winds. The columns of the Aligarh Institution Gazette have been open to the vilest abuse and all the available English and vernacular dailies are requisitioned for this propaganda of invection, calumny and scandal. But with the help of the band of those staunch, sturdy and strong-minded young students, the newly inaugurated National Muslim University has gone on daily adding to its number until six bungalows have now been rented to accommodate the students who have joined the University. We have no fear for the future. We have full faith that our University will go forward on its march of progress and one day, God willing, the old institution being purged of all its evils will merge into the new.

The sister National University at Ahmedabad with Mahatma Gandhi, its Chancellor and that noble and brave man Mr. A.T. Gidwani, as the Principal will keep the torch of learning alight in Guzrat, illuminating the darkness of the institutions where knowledge is only a concomitant of moral and mental slavery.

The Khalsa College, the Islamia College of Lahore and Hindu University students are putting up a brave fight. Our best wishes are with them in their efforts to break the fetters which still enslave them.

Our sincere congratulations and good wishes are offered to the Board of Management and students of the Nadwat-ul-Ulema at Lucknow for the way in which they have refused the Government grant.

As for the National Schools so many are daily coming into existence all over the country that it is difficult at present to furnish a complete list. There

is a great future for the education on National lines and if Non-cooperation does nothing more than removing the evils of the present system of education it shall have fully justified its inception.

Swadeshi have received a great impetus from the movement of Non-cooperation. Everywhere larger and larger number of people are taking to wearing clothes manufactured in India. We have not reliable data to give exact figures but the opening of Swadeshi stores and emporia all over the country is a sure index to the increased use of Indian goods. Though hand spun yarn and handlooms are still in their infancy, it is not too much to hope that there is a sure future for this branch of Indian industry.

The response of the lawyers, one feels constrained to admit has been very poor. The number of those who have given up their practice is probably the largest in the Madras Presidency and the least in Bengal. Arbitration Courts are in the process of formation in a number of big centres. Speaking for Delhi, although we have not yet fully organised our courts the number of cases already disposed of has been nearly one hundred.

There has been a fair number of renunciation of titles and honorary posts. Considering the class of people who generally hold them, this number is not discouraging.

CRITICISMS

So far the criticisms against Non-cooperation have been made from three groups of people *i.e.*, the Moderates, the European and Anglo-Indian papers, and Government officials. These criticisms may be summarised under the following heads.

Those who call the programme of Non-cooperation destructive do not seem to have carefully read the programme. If they had, they would have seen that there is construction going on simultaneously with destruction, for instance, with the boycott of the councils there is simultaneously the education of the electors regarding their demand for full Swaraj with the withdrawal of students from schools and colleges, there is the establishment of National Colleges and schools and so far as the teaching institutions are concerned the aim is to nationalise existing institutions, (vide the Nadwat-ul-Ulema College, Lucknow) and it is only when the authorities refuse to give up the Government grant-in-aid that the need of withdrawing students from them and opening new institutions is felt. Hence, the responsibility of destroying the existing institutions is not entirely on the shoulders of Non-cooperation but on those as well who refuse to give up the Government grant-in-aid although in many cases they admit the evils arising from the grants. Similarly in the case of lawyers the suspension of their practising in the Government courts will be followed by the formation of Arbitration courts where a number of them may find work. Moreover, the critics forget that Non-cooperation is not an end in itself but simply a means to attain Swaraj which surely is the most constructive of all constructive things.

It is forgotten by the critics that Non-cooperation is non-violent and the very fact of eschewing violence of every kind shows that it is not based on hatred or enmity against any individual. Not only does it include the preaching and practising of non-violence but the non-cooperator is strictly enjoined to make it his personal concern to consider the life, honour, and property of every man, English or Indian, sacred and inviolable. It is fully realised by non-cooperators that any violence would end in the utter failure of this method of achieving Swaraj. Whatever bitterness exists is the result of Government's action regarding the Punjab and the Khilafat. It can fairly be claimed that non cooperation has had the effect of lessening the bitterness and directing the thoughts and energies of the people towards self-discipline, self-sacrifice and organisation. Sacrifice and not hatred is the basis of Non-cooperation.

It has been demonstrated both during the Punjab disturbances and other times if the masses have been controlled and diverted from violence and fury, it is by means of Satyagraha and the Non-cooperation movement. It is the fashion of the opponents of Non-cooperation to ascribe every act of lawlessness as the result of Non-cooperation. Facts prove just the contrary. Non-co-operation appeals to the finest instinct of the people, whether they are educated or ignorant. It preaches law and order, it preaches self-discipline and self-sacrifice, it preaches non violence.

The very fact that this money is called 'Government grant-in-aid' and is given and accepted as a bounty he Government shows that although the money comes from the tax payer's pockets, it is given as a gift from the Government to the people. It becomes all the more degrading that the money collected from the people used by the Government for imposing irksome conditions and restrictions on the people. Can it be truthfully said that this money is used as freely and without any let or hindrance as the money received as contribution from the people at large ? Can these institutions stop the meddlesome inspectors of schools from visiting these institutions and generally misdirecting their work while receiving the Government grants-in-aid ? Can these institutions use text-books of their own choosing, or invite any one to lecture to the boys on the economic slavery of India or any such subject ? It is clear that Government by giving this pittance controls the institutions fully and completely though the money may be our own, and if anything is fatal to the free growth of our educational institutions it is the Government's control whose admitted aim is to denationalise Indians and to make slaves and clerks of them.

This criticism pre-supposes that the councils confer some real benefit on the people. Past experience and the constitution governing the new councils prove otherwise. The councils have no control over the Army, the Navy, or Foreign relations, the Civil Service, the Imperial Educational Service, the Indian Medical Service, Finance, the Fiscal policy, and indeed on anything that really matters regarding the Government of the country. The Governors and the Viceroy have still got unlimited powers of veto. What would be

the use then of going to these councils, and wasting time in useless debates.

THE GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE

At first the attitude of the Government was that of ridicule. Every epithet that could show the movement in bad light was used. Nothing could be more futile or ill-advised. It was said that the movement was bound to fail by reason of its intrinsic inanity. The nature of this visionary scheme was unpractical. It was the most foolish of all foolish schemes. But the ridicule did not kill this movement and the Government had to assume a less contemptuous way of dealing with the situation. A solemn effort was made to rally the supporters of the Government. The Moderates were asked to organise themselves to destroy this movement, otherwise it was threatened that repression would be started. Inspite of the efforts of the faithfully Moderates this inane movement did not die and as the efforts 'to laugh out' the movement missed the mark, ridicule by Government and inane efforts of the Moderates soon changed to words and deeds full of gravity and the mighty Government felt constrained to resort to coercion, the last weapon in its armoury. Repression which was started by the prosecution of a number of people has now given place to gagging large and important sections of the Indian people by the application of the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act of 1911, Part 11 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 to politically advanced areas. Nor is this all; for worse thing still appear to be in store for this 'laughable' movement. After all if it was only a contemptible fly, which it was supposed to be, where is the necessity of killing it with a sledge hammer used with the force of a giant ?

CONCLUSION

So far I have dealt with facts familiar to all and covered what is well-known ground. But I may, without intending to weary you, add a few more words. There appears to be a kind of deadlock between the bureaucracy and the people of this land, from the point of the view of the Government, and all because India has awakened, after age-long slumber to a keen sense of self-respect, self-reliance and self-organization; because India is now determined not to submit to any 'Secondary position' in matters which are primarily her and her children's concern. She has awakened to a strong sense of present thraldom and helotry; and also of her legitimate heritage of freedom. The bureaucrat is still thinking in the obsolete terms of governing with the mailed first covered under the velvet glove because he cannot reconcile himself to the perfectly valid claims of self-respecting India, and continues to dream sweet dreams of gaining yet another lease of autocratic life for exploiting the rich resources of our country and the noble and self-effacing nature of our poor intimidated countrymen. The deadlock is inevitable because while we have ceased to think in terms of slavery, the heartless bureaucratic machinery, incapable of 'imagination', continues to work as before we refused

to be exploited, and the Government devices cunning plans to ensure us, to coax, cajole or coerce us into submission. But they forget that we are no longer inspired by any but the highest ideal of complete Swaraj, which leaves no room for any bargains for seats on legislative bodies or transferred subjects. So long as we have no plenary powers of control, guide and change the entire Government of our country according as it (Government) well could suit the interests of the largest number of our friends continue to din into our eass the virtues of the 'advance' the new conditions mark ? So long as they do not divest themselves of the mentality which cannot cease to talk of 'advances and concessions' there is no hope of the deadlock coming to an end. To us, however, who are determined to redeem our birth right, at any cost, 'excepting violence', the state of affairs described as a deadlock marks the beginning of our self-organizing efforts. The Government have forfeited our confidence by violating their pledges, eulogising tyrants, and supporting perpetrators of inhuman atrocities and other exhibition of a sad want of morality. The feeling of distrust has permeated the masses not only of India but of the whole East, as borne out by what the Egyptians, the Arabs, the Kamalist Turks, the Persian nationalists, the Chinese and last but not the least, the Japanese have at different times and independently of one another said in non-official or semi-official organs of opinion. This also appears to be the opinion of even such a partisan as Sir Valentine Chirol.

To win the co-operation of India there is nothing for our alien friends but first, to disabuse their minds of 'domination, race supremacy' and kindred evils; secondly, to do ample penance for past wrong such as the dismemberment and the subjugation of the Khalifa, temporal and spiritual empire, and the massacre of Jallianwala; and lastly, to recognise in unmistakable terms and in actual practice the sovereignty of the people of India.

As regards the suggestion about a Conference of Leaders of public opinion it may be said that in the present state of high tension in the country no good purpose can be served by attempting any 'approachment' before there has been a complete vindication of the people's honours and sovereignty. No one can say that the wanton blows that are being dealt at the self-organizing efforts of honest patriots can ever result at any pacification. There is no trace of any willingness on the part of Government or certain important sections of anti-Indian Europeans—the consideration of whose views seems to weigh so much with the bureaucrats—to descend from the clouds, infact, their appears to be a good deal too much of the 'pride of power'.

After the reading of the speeches of the Chairman, Reception Committee and President, the Muslim League meeting was adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

The All India Muslim Leauge resumed its sitting on 31st Dec. 1920 in the Congress pandal and passed the following resolutions :

The All India Muslim League deeply deplores the sad demise of the Sheikh-ul-Hind Muhammad-ul-Hasan Saheb of Deoband. The League offers its heart-felt condolences to the bereaved family of the Maulana. The All India Muslim League welcomes the establishment of the National Muslim University at Aligarh and congratulates the Principal, Mr. Muhammad Ali, upon his intrepid leadership and his students upon their invincible courage displayed in the performance of their duty in the face of great provocations and hardships. The League calls upon the public to give the University their best moral and material support. The League expresses its deep sorrow on the sudden demise of Mr. Mumtaz Hussain, Bar-at-Law, of Lucknow, and expresses its sympathy with the bereaved family.

THE CREED

The objects of the All India Muslim League shall be :

The attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by all peaceful and legitimate means.

To protect and advance the political, religious and other rights and interests of the Indian Mussulmans.

To promote the friendship and union between the Mussulmans and other communities of India.

To maintain and strengthen the brotherly relations between the Mahomedans of India and those of other countries.

Mr. Muhammad Ali while moving the resoultion changing the creed of the Muslim League by substituting the attainment of Swarajya by all legitimate and peaceful means, said that the existing creed was not up to date in view of the existing circumstances when loyalty to the British Government and self-Government within the British Empire were out of question as long as British Government persisted in their anti-Islam, and anti-India policy. The same view was held by the Congress and the Sikh League and other public bodies. Mahatma Gandhi and those who shared his religious beliefs maintained that peaceful means were the only legitimate means to fight the Government now and for ever, but the Muslim faith went a step further, and said that, if the existence of the evil could not be removed without violence, it must be removed with violence. Force could be used to defeat force. To-day, however, Indian Muslims recognised that they were not in a position to use force against the force of Government, but if the Government's anti-Indian policy still continued and peaceful means were useless, then this resolution could not interfere with the use of force, if required. The rules and regulations of a public body, like the Muslim league, must be interim resolutions to meet the existing state of affairs. This resolution would assure the Government

that the Muslims would not resort to violence, but if even, in the face of this resolution, the Government would use force against them, then the people would stand by their creed and observe non-violence.

The resolution was supported by Hakim Ajmal Khan and three others.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani moved the original resolution. He said that time might come when violence be required to fight the Government. He was supported by two others.

Mr. Muhammad Ali replying to the debate, said the wording of the resolution were in conformity with the situation today and if some circumstances arose later on the creed could again be changed to suit the time.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani demanded a division, and the president ruled that voting would be taken later on.

COW SACRIFICE

While reaffirming the resolution passed by the League at the Amritsar session regarding the cow sacrifice, the League exhorts the Mussulmans of India to continue unabated their earnest efforts in the direction. The League at the same time appeals to its Hindu brethren to refrain from securing legislative measures which, it fears, would only add to the difficulties of the situation.

NON-COOPERATION

Hakim Ajmal Khan then moved the following resolution.

The All India Muslim League reaffirms the resolutions passed at its special session in Calcutta regarding non-violent Non-cooperation.

The League places on record its satisfaction at the progress the Non-cooperation movement has made generally and in particular at the boycott of Councils by the Nationalists and at the refusal to exercise their right of voting by the vast majority of the electors of the various constituencies established under the Reform Scheme. In view of the unmistakable attitude of the electors, the League calls upon those who have secured seats on the various Councils in direct opposition to the will of the electors to resign their seats, and in the case of those who fail to do so, the League advises the electors to have no political connection whatsoever with the so-called representatives. The League also expresses its sense of appreciation of the response made to the call of duty by the youths of India, and while emphasising the absolute necessity of the immediate severance of all connection with the Government aided Colleges and Schools, calls upon the owners and trustees of all the educational institutions to forthwith give up Government aid and disaffiliate themselves from the Government recognised universities. The League at the same time requests the parents and guardians to withdraw their sons and wards from the Government aided or controlled institutions without any further delay, and it also calls upon the adult students to withdraw from such institutions.

The League further urges lawyers and litigants to immediately boycott Government Courts and to establish, encourage, and popularise Arbitration Courts.

Lastly, the League exhorts the people of India to encourage Indian industries by the exclusive use of Swadeshi goods and by establishing home industries.

The League expresses its deep sense of appreciation of the work done by the Khilafat Delegation under the intrepid and able leadership of Moulana Muhammad Ali, than whom a more courageous, outspoken and an almost moderate and correct interpreter of the Muslim obligations and Indian sentiments could not be found.

THE ESHER REPORT

Having regard to the fact that the Esher Committee Report has unmistakably expressed the capitalistic and imperialistic designs of British statesmen by suggesting the utilisation of Indian manhood for the aggressive policy of British conquest, the All-India Muslim League exhorts the people to save their soldiery from moral degradation by increasing their efforts for the attainment of Swaraj at the earliest possible date.

REPRESSIVE MEASURES

In view of the numerous prosecutions of the National workers by the Government, the application of the Seditious Meetings Act to various places in the Punjab and Delhi, and the suppression of volunteer organisations, the All India Muslim League feels confident that the determination of the people of India would continue undaunted to persue the path which they have marked out for the emancipation of their country.

The League, while disapproving the action of the trustees of educational institutions which have not given up Government aid and have not disaffiliated themselves from the Government universities, places on record its appreciation of the whole-hearted response to the call of duty made by the Nadvat-ul-Ulema College at considerable financial sacrifice and has set a noble example for the other institutions to follow.

HOME INDUSTRIES

The League advises the owners, trustees and managing boards of all Muslim educational institutions, religious or otherwise, to immediately start technical classes, with a view to encourage home industries, particularly weaving and spinning.

BRITAIN AND AFGHANISTAN

In view of the fact that the Indian National Congress, the All-India Muslim League, the Sikh League, the Khilafat Conference and other public bodies have declared the resolution of attaining Swaraj, and in the view of

As regards the Mahatma's programme, the President said that everybody was free to express his own opinion, but at the same time everybody should follow the collective wisdom of the whole community. They were prepared to respect every law, but that so far as religion was concerned they were not prepared to go against it. They should strengthen their mind in such a way that nothing would be able to shatter their belief. They should further distinguish between what may be termed as true law and what may be opressive law which stiffles their conviction. There was a sharp line of distinction between spiritual law and temporal law. The President then quoted a Hadis of Mussulman Law which says that in matters spiritual every true Mussulman should follow the tenets of Islam only.

Mr. Yakub Hossein next addressed the Conference. He announced that the next sitting would be held at 8 p. m., in the evening. The Conference then came to a close and various provinces went to committee meetings to select the members of the subject committee which was held after a short time. The Conference again met in the evening in the Congress Pandal. More delegates and visitors were now present than in the morning and among them were many Hindus.

As the President could not be present owing to indisposition, Maulana Azad Sobhani of Cawnpore took the Chair amid cheers. He explained in detail what was meant by the word Khilafat from both religious and temporal points of view and concluded with an appeal to rise to the height of the occasion and save Islam from its imminent danger.

RESOLUTIONS

Pandit Rambhuj Dutta Chowdhery moved the first resolution.

1. 'This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference reaffirms its former decision that in view of the hostile attitude of the British Government and the Allies towards the Khilafat, and the cruel and unjust Turkish Peace terms, which can never be accepted by the Muslim world, there is no course left to the Indian Muslims but to carry constant agitation against the Peace terms up to the last until the spiritual and temporal status of the Khilafat is restored *status quo ante-bellum*.'

In moving this resolution the speaker assured the Mussulmans of cooperation of the Hindus. Dr. Raj Kumar Chakrabarty of Dacca supported the resolution in a nice Bengali speech. The resolution was carried unanimously.

Maulvi Abdul Goffur of Peshawar, Secretary of the Local Khilafat Committee, moved the second resolution :

2. 'This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference offers their heartfelt sympathy to those Indian Muslims who have already performed and are willing to perform Hijrat as a religious duty for the preservation and glorification of their faith and consider it their duty to support such people for the fulfilment of the sacred object.

'The Conference further resolved that the Central Khilafat Committee of

India should include the Hijrat movement in its practical programme and should take upon itself all arrangements for the Mahajarin.'

Maulana Ataulla Shaheb of Amritsar seconded the resolution which was supported by Maulana Shaukat Ali and Malik Isa Mohamed. The resolution was carried with acclamation.

(At this stage Lala Lajpat Rai made his appearance and at the request of Maulana Shaukat Ali, addressed the gathering).

Mr. Abdul Rahim Khan, of Balaghat (M.P.), proposed the next resolution which was duly seconded, supported and carried.

3. 'This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference declares with perfect certainty and precision that Non-cooperation is a religious obligation absolutely binding on the Indian Muslims. It is therefore essential that the Indian Muslims should first of all carry out this religious duty completely and successfully in the Khilafat movement.'

4. The following resolutions were also passed.

'This Conference strongly protests against the policy adopted by the British Government with regard to certain Islamic countries in general and the seat of the Khilafat, and Mesopotamia in particular; and expresses with regret that inspite of the laws of 'Shariat' so clearly stated by the Indian Muslims, Muslim armies are still kept up and are being despatched to those countries.'

5. 'This Conference further warns the Government that this policy of their is adding to the popular excitement, for the consequences of which the Government will be responsible.'

6. 'This Conference expresses its sorrow at the helpless condition which the Khilafat-ul-Muslims is reduced and forced to accept the unjust decision of the Allies; and also records its protest against those who are responsible for this decision. It also assures His Majesty that until that status which can be rightfully held by the Khalifa as successor to the Holy Prophet of Islam, the Indian Muslim will not sit at rest, and will regard it as an eternal happiness to shed their last drop of blood for the maintenance of the integrity of the Khilafat.'

7. 'This Conference expressess its gratitude to His Majesty Amir Amanullah Khan, the Ruler of Afghanistan for the Islamic brotherhood with which he has received and treated the Indian Muhajarin, and trusts that all possible facilities will be given to the Indian Muhajarin by the Afghan Government in future also.'

8. 'This Conference considers the Hindu-Muslim Unity absolutely essential for the future betterment of India; and expresses its satisfaction that through the grace of the Almighty God, this unity is getting further strength day by day.'

9. 'This Conference appeals to all the Mussulmans of India to collect, as soon as possible a sum of at least thirty lacs of rupees for the successful working of the Khilafat movement.'

10. 'This Conference requests all the Provincial Khilafat Committees of India to organise volunteer corps under each and every Khilafat Committee of their respective provinces, to make arrangements to maintain peace and order, to collect funds and to help in the non-cooperation movement.'

11. 'This Conference resolves that a deputation should visit all the prominent Sijjadha Nashins and spiritual heads of shrines to invite their attention to those religious obligations which are binding on them regarding the Khilafat.'

12. 'This Conference expresses its deep sympathy with those Muslims of the North Western Frontier Province and Sind who have fallen victim to unjust official aggression in the Khilafat movement and trusts that they will set an instructive example to their brethren by steadfastly enduring all hardships and troubles which have befallen them in rendering services to the cause of India.'

13. 'This Conference further declares that the N W. F. Province and Sind Governments took unjust and oppressive ways for repressing the Khilafat movement thereby inviting disturbance and disorder for which they will be solely responsible.'

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1921.**

32

REPORT OF SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE JAMIAT-UL-ULEMA SPECIAL PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE HELD AT PATNA

25 and 26 June 1921

25 JUNE 1921—MORNING SESSION

Shah Habib-ul-Haq, after reciting a passage from the Quran said that the purpose for which this Conference had been held was known to almost every one. The other provinces had not yet taken any action in this matter, and the people of this province ought to be proud that the province of Bihar had taken the initiative. There was a special reason why the City of Patna and the province of Bihar had taken the initiative. The city of Azimgunge, which was now called Patna, was a very old city. It was in existence a few centuries before the Christian era. At that time there was a Hindu kingdom here, and many Mahatmas and Pandits resided in Patna and the neighbourhood. Bihar was called in Sanskrit 'Vihar', where there were many madrassas. The province of Bihar had all along been a great seat of learning, and it had

produced many learned men. Then came the Islamic period, when from all directions the cry of the oneness of God was raised and Bihar became famous for its Ulemas. He then mentioned the names of some of the leading Ulemas, past and present. There was a time when about two to three hundred conveyances containing Ulemas used to go about the city. There was an ancient madrassa in the city of Patna, the history of which was known to only a few people. People from other provinces used to come here for the purpose of religious education. There was a time when each Rais had about forty or fifty students living in his house. But the conditions were quite different at present, people became more worldly. There was a time when not only European dress but English shoes were not permitted in their religions and educational institutions. The people of this province took up English education and gradually lost all regard for the Ulemas. Their Government (Hukumat) had gone, but their religious education also disappeared, and the neckles of slavery was put round their necks. The race that was free had became slaves. It would be found that the descendants of many of the Ulemas of the olden days did not properly understand their religion. They had lowered their status in the eyes of the world. The mercy of God, however, would not be withheld from the Mahommedans, and they should pray to God to improve their conditions. It was proposed to have a leader for the province who would be called 'Amir'. He hopes that the other provinces would follow the lead given by Bihar, and that Shaikh-ul-Hind would be finally selected for the whole of India.

Referring to the present sufferings of the Mahommedans, he said that Kerbela, Bait-al-Maqadas and other sacred places had gone, and the condition of Mecca and Medina was deplorable. If there were no certainty of the safety of their sacred places, it was not possible for the Mussulmans to live. God had destroyed Pharoah and Nimrod, and could not God place them on the same throne. The Mahommedans should be constant in their faith, and should be ready to sacrifice their lives for the sake of Islam.

It was stated in the Quran that the Mahommedans should obey their Amir. *O Al Amir minkum* meant 'Ulemas should be obeyed'. He hoped that the Mahommedans would accept the direction given in Quran and obey their Ulemas. In selecting an Amir they should choose a person who was prepared to devote his life in the cause of Islam. Centuries had gone without there being an Amir-i-Shariyat. It was stated in the Hadis that the man who did not give zakath was not a Mahommedan and should be slain. Where was the Zakat today and where was Bait-al-mal. Their cases could not be decided according to their religion, because no courts had been established as required by their religion. Some people were under the impression that the appointment of Amir-i-Shariyat was the business of the Khalifa. It was the duty of the Government to take the fatwa of the Amir. Their present troubles would not be in existence if they had a Shaikh-ul-Hind. If they felt that Khilafat should be saved then it was their bounden duty to elect an Amir. It was well known

that the Prophet himself never sent out a body of men without an Amir or leader. It was the business of this Conference of Ulemas to elect an Amir whom all Mahommedans in the province should obey. The Amir would be elected by the Ulemas attending the Conference, and not by the public at large. In the selection of the Amir the Ulemas should give up all personal feelings and elect a fit and proper person for that high office. It was stated by the Prophet that the man who disobeyed the Amir disobeyed him (the Prophet). He then mentioned the qualifications that a person should possess for the office of Amir-e-Shariyat. The person most suitable for the office of Amir must be one who would take an active interest in Islamic matters. He must be truthful and honest man, and must not be afraid of any power or Government. He should not belong to any party. He should not be self-interested but should be a real follower of the Mahommedan religious laws and customs. He should be a person who would fully consider a *masla* before it was promulgated in order that it might not at a later stage cause any trouble or conflict.

Shah Mohiuddin of Phulwari said that they had heard the speech of Shah Habibul Haq of Patna and knew that they should have a leader so that things would be done in perfect harmony. It was necessary for the Conference to have a president who would regulate the proceedings and whose decision would be final. He proposed that Maulana Abul Kalam Azad be elected President of the Conference.

Shah Habibul Haq of Patna seconded the proposal which was carried.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad thanked the Ulemas and others for having elected him as the President of the Conference and said that he had come to the Conference although he was indisposed. He had pimples on his feet which had caused him great suffering. He had devoted the last ten years of his life in the very object for which this Conference had been held, and that was the reason why although he was indisposed, he had undertaken the journey to Patna. He would postpone till the meeting on the next day an expression of his views on the principal business before the Conference. He was always opposed to preside at any meeting, and it was only at the persuasion of Maulana Sajjad of Gaya that he had agreed to accept the Presidentship. Referring again to the pimples on his feet, he said that this was an ordinary complaint with which many of them were well acquainted. He had noticed the pimples in the morning of the previous day, and by evening the whole of his body was in pain. The pain could be felt from his head down to his feet. It was due to this pain that he could not have any rest at night. It was strange how the pain, which had arisen in a small portion of the body, could be felt in every part of the body. There were no signs of sleep in his eyes, although the pimples were not in his eyes. This reminded him of the definition of Islam given by the Prophet that although the body consisted of different parts the whole was united together and each part was in sympathy with the other parts of the body. If there was pain in any particular part of

the body a sympathetic pain was bound to be felt in the other parts. That was the relationship of one Mussulman with another. Islam was like a wall which was built with a large number of bricks but the bricks supported one another and kept the wall standing. Islam was just like a wall and required similar support from the Mahommedans. There was no nobler object than that for which they had gathered today. If the Mussulmans obeyed their leader and remained united the structure of Islam would never come to pieces.

26 JUNE 1921—MORNING SESSION

Maulana Hamid said that it had been stated by the Prophet that Islam was like a human body. If there were pain in one part of the body the whole body would suffer in sympathy. Therefore if one part of the Islamic body was in pain the Moslems in all parts of the world would have to suffer. Islam had only one life which was in all parts of the Islamic world, and that was 'La ilaha illilla Muhammad Rasul Allah.' From this he drew the inference that if the whole of the Islamic world had one life than if one Mussulman in one part of the world suffered all the Mussulmans in the world would suffer in sympathy with that one particular Mussulman. If a wire were connected to an electric battery it would be a very valuable thing, but if the wire were disconnected from the battery it would be of no value at all. If the body of the Mussulman were connected with the Islamic battery it would in the same way be very valuable but if it were not so connected it would be of no value in the Islamic world. If this connection could be established then even a lean and weak person would turn into a lion. The Islamic battery was the Prophet, and those who established a connection with that battery would rise in the world. If a finger were separated from the body, the separated finger would not suffer pain that body would have to suffer. In the same manner if one Mahommedan were to be separated from the Islamic body, he would not feel the pain caused to the Islamic body. The Mahommedans should therefore establish their connection with the Islamic battery (the Prophet) and they would meet with success in all their actions.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad apologised for the delay in attending the Conference. He said that the first point towards which he would like to direct their attention was the present state of his feelings. Since he had addressed the Conference on the previous day, he had attended the Ulemas meeting and his heart was now full of the precious things that had been discussed and decided at that meeting. The object of the Conference was to select an Amir Shariyat. What was the object of having an Amir Shariyat. No nation could exist in the world without a Nizam Qaumi and a Nizam Ijtamai (national organization and united organization). The Nizam Ijtamai was to join the various parts of the organization together. He instanced the case of a chain which was strong enough to hold a ship in its place, but individual links of that chain by themselves would not have the same strength

as all the links connected together. The object of Nizam Qaumi or Nizam Mulki was to keep the different parts of the body together. No nation could exist in the world unless the Nizam was strong enough to keep them together. Nizam Qaumi did not mean merely a gathering of people; it meant a national organization. When such a body was formed it would be necessary to have a leader whose orders would be obeyed by that body. Shariyat had enjoined on the Mahommedans the performance of nimaz. If a person went to a mosque he would find various groups or persons standing in various places and engaged in different occupations, but when the call to prayers was sounded all those groups immediately got together and stood in rows to say their prayers. This action was due to their obedience to the call to prayers. The object of having the Mahommedans to say their prayers five times in the day was to teach them the meaning of 'Jamaat'. When a religion did not allow the toe of one Mahommedan to be ahead of that of another Mahommedan while saying their prayers, how was it possible for that religion to allow one Mahommedan to be indifferent towards another. There was one man leading the prayers, and the movements of all the persons were determined by the movements of that one person. This gathering of people for their prayers was called 'Jamaat.' He supported his assertion with passages from the Quran.

If the Mussulmans wished to be real Muslims they would have to follow the five rules laid down in the Quran. They should have an Amir or Peshwa who would place before them the orders of God and Shariyat and it would be the duty of Mussulmans to obey those orders. When the Mussulmans passed through these three stages there were two other possible stages which the Mussulmans might reach. These were (i) Hijrat, and (ii) Jehad. The Mussulmans for the sake of their God and faith would sometimes have to sacrifice everything that they loved and valued, even their country, which included wives, children, relatives, friends, etc. The last stage was 'Waljihad fi sabi lillah' which meant 'to gain your object by means of your hand and your sword in the path of God.' (Khuda ki rah men apne maqsad ko hasil karna apne hath se aur apne talwar ke zariye se). Unless the Mussulmans reached the first three stages, it was not possible for them to reach the last two stage. It is therefore necessary for the Mussulmans to first elect a Nizam Shariyat. The present Mussulmans of India could not be said to be an organized body because they had no leader at their head. The Musslmans should give up all their differences and be united. They should then elect a Peshwa as was laid down in the Hadis.

In December 1914 he had interviewed Maulana Mahmudal Husan in connection with the question of having an Amir Shariyat for each province, but unfortunately it was decided that he should do Hijrat and go out of India. Maulana Mahmud-al-Hasan was the best person for the office of Shaik-ul-Hind, but he was now dead. It was therefore necessary for all the Ulemas of India to select a Shaik-ul-Hind or Amir Shariyat for all India. But before

this could be done it was necessary to have a Jamaat Ulema in each province with an Amir Shariyat at their head by whom the Amir Shariyat for all India would be selected.

He congratulated the Ulemas of this province for having given the lead in this matter, and he hoped that all the other provinces would do the same, and that in the end one leader for all India would be elected. Before they had such a leader, their work in connection with Khilafat and the freedom of the country would not bear any fruit. So long as masiat ijtamai stood in their way there was no chance of success.

The question of the selection of an Amir Shariyat for this province was placed before the Ulemas on the previous day, and after very careful consideration the Ulemas of Bihar had decided to elect Hazrat Maulana Shah Badruddin Sahib of Phulwari as the Amir Shariyat. He was of opinion that this was the best selection and that it would receive universal approval. It was his duty to impress upon them that so long as no announcement had been made regarding the election of an Amir Shariyat matters were different, and after the announcement of the decision of the Ulemas of this province it was incumbent upon the Mahommedans of this province to obey the orders and fatwas of their leader, and the Mussulman who disobeyed those orders would be considered to be not a Muslim and not to belong to the Islamic faith. It was however necessary to have a nabiyath or naib to the Amir Shariyat of this province in order that the naib might be able to perform the work of the Amir as his deputy. It was not possible for the new Amir, who was a racluse, to see that his orders were given effect to, and a deputy was therefore absolutely essential. The Ulemas had selection of Maulana Sajjad of Gaya for this office, and the selection had received the approval of the Amir. A small executive committee of Ulemas had also been elected consisting of nine Ulemas and the Amir and his naib. This would form the Majlis Shura and would consist of the following Ulemas :

1. Maulana Saiyid Suleman Nadwi.
2. Maulana Abdul Ahad of Darbhanga.
3. Maulana Usman Ghani of Gaya.
4. Maulana Shah Muhiuddin of Phulwari.
5. Maulana Nurul Hasan of Phulwari.
6. Maulana Shah Habibul Haq of Patna.
7. Maulana Zaminul Haq of Arrah.
8. Maulana Abdul Wahab of Arrah.
9. Maulana Kafayet Husain of Patna.

The Ulemas and the others persent at the meeting then publicly declared their allegiance to the Amir Shariyat and the morning session was closed.

26 JUNE 1921—EVENING SESSION

In the absence of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the President of the Conference, on the motion of Maulana Dana, seconded by Maulavi Tamana,

Maulana Abdul Qadir Azad Sobhani was voted to the Chair.

Maulana Abdul Qadir Azad Sobhani congratulated the province of Bihar in being the first to elect an Amir Shariyat. He asked the audience to attend very carefully to what he was going to say, otherwise it was possible that their enemies would lead them astray. First of all he wished to give the history of the movement which had ultimately resulted in the election of an Amir Shariyat of this province. The appointment of an Amir was of the greatest importance for the Mussulmans. The Jamaat-al-Ulema had its origin in Gaya. He was invited to attend the annual Conference of the Madrassa at Gaya, and on his way to that place it occurred to him that some steps might be taken to spread the knowledge of Islam in a fit and proper manner among the Mussulmans. The first step in this direction was to form a Jamaat-al-Ulema. It seemed to him that so long as the Ulemas did not take it upon themselves to instruct the Mussulmans in matters of Shariyat it would not be possible for them to attain their object. It was therefore necessary to establish the position of the Ulemas and to bring them out of the madrassas to the field of action (maidan-e-amal). He prepared an outline of the scheme and placed it before Maulana Sajjad of Gaya, but this pencil sketch did not seem to have the desired effect on his friend Maulana Sajjad, who could not understand how the Ulemas would come forward, unite, and lead the Muslims. He (the speaker) was certain of the result, that when the Ulemas were roused from their lethargy they were sure to rise to the occasion. He therefore told Maulana Sajjad, that the first thing to do was to establish a Jamaat-al-Ulema. He had also told Maulana Sajjad that the Jamaat-al-Ulema would soon bear fruit. Maulana Sajjad had thereupon along with three or four other Ulemas established a Jamaat-al-Ulema at Gaya, which gradually increased in number till it embraced the whole province. He was certain that the fruit of this tree, the seed of which was sown in Gaya, would strengthen the faith of the Mussulmans. It was then considered necessary to have a leader of the Ulemas who would guide the people in their religious duties. In other provinces also efforts were made with success to establish Jamaat-al-Ulema, and from among the Jamaat-al-Ulema of all the provinces a Jamaat-al-Ulema Hind was established There was no difference between the terms 'Shaik-ul-Islam Hind' and 'Amir Shariyat Hind'. Both these terms meant that the leader was the trustee of the Islamic faith in India.

It was a very difficult thing to elect an Amir Shariyat Hind, because first of all an Amir Shariyat would have to be elected in each province, and from among these an Amir Shariyat Hind would have to be chosen.

He again congratulated the province for having selected their Amir Shariyat and hoped that they would soon gain strength in their faith, which was absolutely necessary at the present time. But they must not think that they had finished their work. The selection of the Amir was still in its infancy. The Ulemas should also remember that they had greater responsibilities now on their shoulders. Until now the Ulemas had only held their Conference at

various places, but now by the selection of an Amir Shariyat they had established a sound foundation and if they did not fulfil their responsibilities it would be a great shame. If the Amir Shariyat had not been selected no one would have looked to the Ulemas for guidance.

There are four factors which had so far taken very little interest in the work of the Ulemas, but which were today very watchful of their actions. The first was Government. It was due to the negligence of the Ulemas that the Government had not taken much notice of them. They used to regret this state of affairs. They had placed their views before Mr. Montague, but he had not paid the amount of attention to their wishes as was considered necessary. Many of them felt really sorry that Government was not in sympathy with their wants. But today by the election of their Amir Shariyath they had proclaimed to the world that they were no longer asleep, and they might rest assured that the Government would now cast their searching eyes on their actions. They would however have to remember that if they were unsuccessful in this journey, or if they wearied of it, their condition would be worse than it was ever before.

The next factor was called siyasi or political tabaq. This had particular reference to the attitude of Government towards the Ulemas. He did not say that the Government had no sympathy with the Ulemas, but the Ulemas has not made themselves objects of such importance in the eyes of Government. The Government had never tried to improve the status of the Ulemas, and the people had themselves helped Government to let the Ulemas be carried down the stream of poverty. The Ulemas should therefore bear in mind that they would have to be very careful of their future actions.

The third factor was Hindu-Muslim unity. This matter should receive the particular attention of the Ulemas, and they should be careful to see that their actions in religious matters (harkat-al-shariya) did not destroy the present relations between Hindus and Mussulmans. The Government might think that the election of an Amir Shariyat might be the beginning of a declaration of Jihad. The intentions of the Ulemas should always be pure and clean. The Jama'at-al-Ulema should help in the attainment of Swaraj. The Mussulmans had the same desire for Swaraj as the Hindus, and when Swaraj was attained Hindus and Mussulmans should live on equal terms. The Nizam Shariyath of the Mussulmans should be free from all party politics, and should be an impartial and honest person, so that the Mussulmans might be able to live peacefully without coming into conflict with people of other creeds. It was not the intention of the Mussulmans, by the election of an Amir Shariyath or Amir Hind to make the Hindu their slaves. The Hindus and Mussulmans were at present the slaves of the British Government. They should therefore have in one hand the flag of Swaraj and in the other the flag of Nizam Shariyat. The Hindus should also join hands with the Mussulmans. If they could do that they would be able to live very successfully for many years to come.

The fourth factor was Awam tabaq. He wished everything that was

underground to come to the surface. He did not want any secrecy. How many were there among those who had that morning declared their allegiance to the Amir Shariyat, who were not straight-forward and honest, and who had doubts in their mind. He must warn them of those people. When the Amir Shariyat would wish to punish those who had offended against the Islamic Shariyats, perhaps there would be some who would try and break through their allegiance and help the offenders.

They had elected their Amir Shariyat, but unless the Ulemas realized their responsibilities it would be very difficult to guide the ship of Islam through troublesome waters. The Amir Shariyat his naib and the executive committee ought to ascertain how religious education was progressing in the province. If they did not try to improve the condition of their religious education they would never be able to gain their object. They ought to have a very good knowledge of politics, otherwise the whole of their structure would come to pieces. They ought to understand the fraudulent and alluring diplomacy of the British, otherwise the Ulemas, even with all the strength that their faith could command, would be defeated at every step. The result would be similar to the present fate of Turkey which had depended on the honesty of others and had come to grief. This was simply due to the diplomacy of Europe, and today the greater part of the kingdom of Turkey has been divided among other people. The Ulemas should understand the present knavery and fraud (maujuda aiyari and farebi). He did not wish that his arguments should be taken to mean that they aimed at the overthrow of any Government or Power. He wished to make that point very clear. If the Ulemas or Jamaat-al-Ulema considered it necessary to go against any Government action they should act according to their own religious principles. If any thing stood in their way, even though it be a mountain, they would try their best to remove it. (Agar koi tumhare safar ke samne ai to woh kaisi sung ya pahar ho uske hatane ki koshish ki jaigi). If any Government (taqat) wished to stand in their way, they would remove that trouble (Zahmat) be that due to any jamaat, Government or anything else. He wished to make it very clear the Jamaat-al-Ulema had not been established to destroy the British Raj. If there was such a Jamaat-al-Ulema in India, it was not the Jamaat-al-Ulema. The Jamaat-al-Ulema had only been established to improve the religious training of the Mussulmans and to see that things were done according to the Mussulman faith and religious laws. The Mussulamans should follow in the path of the prophet and nothing would be able to harm them. But if any Government or Power should come in their way the Mussulmans would be bound to oppose that Power.

He desired it to be conveyed to Government through the notes that were being recorded at the Conference that, whether non-cooperation continued or not, the Jamaat-al-Ulema would be of great help to Government in deciding matters connected with the Muslim faith. The Government had made the mistake in not having understood the real wishes of the Muslim community

of India, and that was the reason why Government had not been able to apply the proper remedy for the complaint from which the Mussulmans were suffering. The Government were under the impression that the Mussulmans were in the hands of Government, and it was owing to this mistake that Government had not understood the complaint of the Mussulmans. If the Mussulmans complained that a portion of their mosque was desired to be demolished and that to prevent this they were prepared to lay down their lives, Government thought that this was mere idle talk, and that if a portion of the mosque were taken away for the improvement of a road there was absolutely no harm done. Government did not understand why the mere demolition of a portion of a mosque should cause so much anxiety. The advisers of Government did not fully understand the Mahommedan faith, and advised the Government that Mahommedans were merely taking advantage of the situation to create trouble. Whatever had happened to the Khilafat, the Sultan of Turkey or their sacred places did not seem to have affected the Government to any great extent, because the persons who conducted the Government had not understood these things. The Government of England thought that all the complaints about the Khilafat were mere nonsense. When the condition of Islam and Khilafat was placed before the British Government, the diplomates of England thought that it was merely a piece of diplomacy, and that the Mussulmans wished to catch the British in the net of their diplomacy. He wanted the Government to realize their error. If Government had granted the prayers of the Mussulmans there would not have been so much trouble with the Mussulmans. Even if the Government had not helped the Mussulmans so far, he would ask the Government to grant the request of the Tabaq-e-Ulema which had now been established. If the Jamaat-al-Ulema issued a fatwa the Government should stretch a helping hand towards the Mussulmans to comply with that fatwa, otherwise it would not be possible for the Mussulmans to take the hand of the Government. He also appealed to the Mussulmans to remain firm in their duty towards the Jama'at-al-Ulema and to act according to the orders and fatwas issued by them.

The Mussulmans had lost their kingdom, because they were not firm in their faith. When they came under a European Power they thought that perhaps with the help of Western education that they received they would be able to gain their freedom. That was a mistake. The Nizam Shariyat should now take the lead, and if the Mussulmans followed him they would gain their heart's desire.

Referring to the Angora Government, he said that a resolution in connection with that Government would be placed before the Conference and he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously. The Jamaat-al-Ulema had the same connection with the Government of Angora as they had with Roumania. They had both protectors of Shariyat. The Government of Angora did not want to enlarge its dominians by conquering the territories of other nations, but it wished to help the tottering Government of Islam.

The Government of Angora had not drawn the sword in order to destroy the British nor to conquer the territories of the Greeks, nor to snatch India from the hands of the British or the Indians. The Government of Angora had drawn the sword in order to protect the sacred places of Islam, and to save Constantinople, which was the seat of Islam, from the power of the enemy. The Mussulmans of India should therefore understand that the Government of Angora was on a religious mission. Jihad was permissible in the Mahommedan religion provided it was carried out in the correct manner. The War of the Government of Angora against its enemy was in the nature of Jihad, and if the Jamaat-al-Ulema considered that the Government of Angora was fighting for the rights of Islam, then they must express their sympathy with that Government. He did not mean to say that the Jamaat-al-Ulema should join forces with the Government of Angora and declare Jihad, but they should express full sympathy with the noble object of the Government of Angora. The Jamaat-al-Ulema would not advise the drawing of the sword or the use of violence connection with the non-cooperation movement. If the Jamaat-al-Ulema used their influence 'and power in the cause of the non cooperation movement they could without the least doubt put an end to present condition of the Angora Government, and the British Government would have to accede to their prayer. The Jamaat-al-Ulema could help both the non-cooperation movement and the Government of Angora by joining their forces with those of the, non-cooperators.

It had been mentioned in the newspapers that the British Government would help the Greeks to defeat the forces of the Government of Angora. He would not advise the Jamaat-al-Ulema or the Mussulmans in general to lose their heads in this matter. If they attained Swaraj all this would come to an end, and the only way to get Swaraj was by joining forces with the non-cooperators. He wished to warn Government, although he should not do so being a non-cooperator *fit* to oppress or attack the Government of Angora, which was the only one free Islamic Government in the world. He did not think that it was the supreme aim of the British Government to destroy this little Government with all the forces at their command. He wished to appeal to Government not to oppress the Mussulmans any more, and not to prevent the Mussulmans from following the non-cooperation movement.

Maulana Sajjad of Gaya said that the resolution in connection with the Government of Angora could not at present be placed before the Conference. The resolution would first have to be considered by the Jamaat-al-Ulema Hind, after which it would be placed before the Provincial Jamaat-al-Ulema Conference for adoption.

Maulana Muhiuddin of Phulwari proposed a vote of thanks, after which the Conference was brought to a close.

Source : Home Department, Political, 1921, F. No. 180.

33

REPORT FROM D. I. G. OF POLICE CRIME OF A CONFERENCE OF ULEMAS HELD AT PATNA

25 and 26 June 1921

50 Ulema attended Admission by ticket 400 members present. The speeches delivered by Maulanas Abul Kalam Azad and Azad Sobhani outline a scheme for the complete organisation of the community throughout the country under selected religious leaders and under the general control of one religious head. Maulana A. K. Azad is not so explicit, but Maulana Azad Sobhani speech leaves no doubt that the scheme contemplating the elevation of the Ulema to the position of political as well as religious leaders, and the exclusion from leadership of purely lay persons who have hitherto been accepted by the community as their political guides.

The general trend of recent Mahommedan politics in the Province has been designed to foster the impression that the Christian powers have united against Islam, and that it is useless looking to the British Government to safeguard Islamic interests. The speeches were violent and were obviously intended to arouse the community to a high pitch of religious excitement and enthusiasm. In the circumstance, this attempt at the organisation or the community under religious leaders liable to external fanatical influence, may if generally successful lead to the formation of a Nationalist Muslim Party, which it will be difficult to control.

It was emphasised by A. K. Azad that the Jamiat must have a Shaikhul Hind or Amir Shariyat for all India. The branches of the Jamiat in each province was said to be founded In December 1914 Maulana Azad had a talk with Mahmudul Hasan in connection with an Amir-e-Jamiat. Mahmudul Hasan was thought to be the best man but he was no more. The Jamaat-al-Ulema had its origin in Gaya. It was thought that so long as the Ulemas did not take it upon themselves to instruct the Mussulmans in matters of Shariyat, it would not be possible for them to attain their object. It was therefore considered necessary to establish the position of the Ulemas and to bring them out of the madrassas to the field of action (Maidan-e-Amal). In other provinces also efforts were made with success to establish Jamaat-al-Ulema and from among the Jamaat-al-Ulema of all the provinces a Jama' at-al-Ulema Hind was established.

The aim of the Jamiat was Hindu-Muslim unity. This received the particular attention of the Ulemas, and they were asked to be careful to see that their actions in religious matter did not destroy the present relation between Hindus and Mussulmans. The Jamiat should help in the attainment of Swaraj. The Mussulman had the same desire for Swaraj as the Hindus,

and when Swaraj was attained Hindus and Mussulmans should live on equal terms. The Hindus and Muslims were considered to be the slaves of the British Government. They should therefore have in one hand the flag of Swaraj and in the other the flag of Nizam Shariyat. While well versed in theology, the Ulema were also asked to be expert in politics, otherwise the whole of their structure would come to pieces. They ought to understand the fraudulent and alluring diplomacy of the British otherwise they would be defeated on every step.

Regarding Angora Government Azad said that the Mussulmans of India should understand that the Government of Angora was a religious mission. The War of the Government of Angora against its enemy was in the nature of Jehad, and if the Jamaat-al-Ulema considered that the Government of Angora was fighting for the rights of Islam, then they must express their sympathy with the Government. It did not mean that Jamiat would declare Jehad but it would sympathise with the Government of Angora.

Source : Home Department, Political, 1922, F. No. 868.

34

LEAFLET ISSUED BY THE NAZIM-UMUMI (GENERAL MANAGER), 'DARUL-ISHAAT-I-HIND', DELHI

The religious Fatwa of the Ulemas of all India—

(1) It is not permissible to become a member of the Government Councils.

(2) It is not permissible to plead as vakil before the British Courts.

(3) It is not permissible to read in Government or semi-Government schools.

(4) It is not permissible to keep Honorary Magistracies, other honorary posts and the titles conferred by the Government.

(5) All Government services by which Government is helped are (haram) forbidden; specially serving in the Police and the Army is a great sin, because they have to fire upon their brethren. God says (a quotation from the Quran) 'One who kills a Mussulman deliberately will be subjected to the eternal hell fire.' The prophet has said 'Whoever took up arms against Muslims he ceases to be a Muslim'.

This Fatwa bears the seals of Maulana Abul Kalam Sahib Azad, Maulvi Kifayat Ullah of Delhi, Maulana Azad Sobhani of Cawnpore, Maulana

Mohammad Daud Ghaznavi, Maulana Abdul Bari of Lucknow, Maulana Sanaullah of Amritsar and Maulana Aziz-ur-Rehman Mufti of the Darul-Ulum, Deoband.

The Fatwa bears also the seals of other Ulemas of India. The original can be had from the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, Delhi.

Note. Mahatma Gandhi and other big Hindu and Mussulman leaders of India have already also proclaimed this thing.

Source: Home Dept. Pol. 1921, F. No. 137.

35

MUTTAFFIQA FATWA PRESENTED BEFORE THE SESSION OF JAMIAT-UL-ULEMA-I-HIND HELD AT DELHI

THE FATWA

In the name of God the most compassionate and merciful. What do the learned in Theology (Ulemai din) and the law givers of the great Shariat say about the following religious propositions :

1. What is meant by 'Mavalat' (co-operation ?) and according to the religion what kind of 'Mavalat' is haram (forbidden) with the enemies of Muslim religion, and what kind of 'tark-i-Mavalat' (non-cooperation) is obligatory ? What is the religious decision about a man who continues to co-operate after knowing the religious commandment on the subject ?

2. Is it included in 'Mavalat' to be a member of the Councils of the Government of India, to be in the legal profession, to practise as a Mukhtar, etc., to obtain education in Government or semi-Government colleges or schools or to have one's children educated there, to take help (grant-in-aid) from Government for education, and to accept honorary magistracy, and titles conferred by the Government ?

3. Is it forbidden for the Mussulman in the present condition to be in the military and other services of the Government which strengthen and consolidate the constitution of the Government ?

4. Is it prohibited in the present condition to use the British goods which gives strength to the British nation ?

5. Is it permissible by the Shariat to have social unity with a non-Muslim who is not inclined to be hostile and also to take help from him in any matter ?

6. Is it permissible by the Shariat to accept sound advice tendered by

a non-Muslim and to act upon it in order to attain a religious object, which is apparently considered adherence to and following the non-Muslim ?

The answer to each of the above questions should be given seriatim in plain and concise language but supported by reasons; please answer and you will be rewarded.

'The answer—God is helper in reaching the right decision.'

Answer no. 1. The word 'Mavalat' in Arabic idiom and the Shariat terminology means love (friendship) and co-operation (helping each other). Its explanation and elucidation is to be found in all books of commentry. 'Mavalat' is forbidden (haram) with enemies of Islam in both senses of the word. God has forbidden 'Mavalat' totally with enemies of Islam whether it is openly or secretly paid or honorary. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'God prevents you from friendship and co-operation with those infidels who fought with you in the matter of religion and ejected you from your countries and helped in your ejectment and expulsion. Those who maintain co-operation with such infidels are tyrants'.

Any Mussulman who in spite of knowledge of his commandment maintains 'Mavalat' with them will be considered a great sinner and in the words of the Quran a tyrant. God says in Chapter (Sura) Maeda (of the Quran) (*Arabic verse*) 'O Mussulman do not make the Jews and the Christians (enemies of Islam) your friend and helpers. They are friends and helpers of each other: whoever from among you will make them his friends and helper will be counted as of their crowd, as God does not guide the tyrant nation'. There is a big and detailed Fatwa by Shah Abdul Aziz of Delhi about 'Mavalat' with infidels. The following are some sentences from it. In the matter of 'Mavalat' with infidels whatever had been written by the law givers of Islams it requires some explanation one should read 'Shorah Ainual Ilm' and Ehyaul-Ulema for it. The purport of it is about 'Mavalat' meaning friendship if it is entertained with them in connection with religion is unanimously Kufr. If it is in connection with wordly matter and is optional, it is haram.

And 'Mavalat' meaning helping and co-operation is based upon some prescribed principles and it is this (*Arabic verse*) to help in Kufr and sin is itself a sin. This decision is unanimous. This proved from the words of God (*Arabic verse*) 'Do not help each other in sin and tyranny'.

And this co-operation is sometimes in lieu of payment which is known as services, and sometimes without any wages which is known as help and support. The Commandment in both the cases is identical. That is, if the infidels wish to fight with a Muslim, or subjugate any country or city of the Mussulmans, their service is haram and to give them help or support is also haram; rather it is a major sin. If they fight among themselves or are collecting riches and administering a country which is in their possession from before and they engage a Mussulman in their service for this, it is apparently permissible to serve them for reasons based on the idea that work like

tailoring, trading etc., is permissible with them, and it is also proved from the life of the respected people that they served the idolators. But on deep contemplation it appears that this too is not free from being *haram*, especially in these days because their service becomes the cause of many evils in the religion and the least of these evils is the carelessness and slowness in discharge of religious duties, refraining from preventing them (their employers) from evil deeds and being their well wishers and advisers, adding to their number, strengthening their grandeur, respecting them beyond limit, calling them 'Khudavand,' 'Sahib' and 'Qibla' and expression of great love for them, etc.

Answer no. 2. All these things are included in 'Mavalat' because these things apparently create love with the Government and indirectly cause help to them. Therefore on the bases of the commandment regarding 'tark-i-Mavalat' it is incumbent to dissociate from all these acts.

Apart from the commandment regarding 'tark-i-Mavalat' it is obligatory for the Mussulmans to give up these things on account of other evils. The detail of all that had been briefly said is this :

The following are the reasons for giving up the Councils —

(*a*) The Council, whether it is legislative or executive, has for its object the strengthening of the constitution and the administration of the Government which amounts to an open support of the Government.

(*b*) Laws which are against the principles of religion are often made in the Councils, to move, support or to remain silent in spite of power to oppose which is not permissible for any Mussulman (*Arabic verse*) 'The Prophet said that if any of you see an evil enacted you should stop it by your own hand, or if you have not power to do so stop it by your tongue, and if you have not power even of this do not approve of it in your heart'. But the Muslim members of the Council do all this and as a testimony in its support are the past events and the enforcements of the present laws in the country.

(*c*) The English nation is also on the Council which is tyrant and the enemy of Islam and it is made *haram* by the *Shariat* to have a distinctive seat with such a nation. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'After recollecting do not sit with the tyrants'.

(*d*) It is incumbent for the members in Council to take oath of loyalty, obedience and faithful towards the Government and in the present condition it is *haram* for the Mussulman to be loyal, obedient and faithful to the Government willingly and freely. Therefore the oath of allegiance is *haram* and a major sin.

The reasons for the legal profession being *haram* are as follows :

(*a*) The members of the legal profession are responsible for maintaining half the constitution of the Government (*i.e.*, the executive branch of the administration) and enfore its laws into practice which is a great help to the Government which had been proved to be *haram*.

(*b*) Most of the civil and criminal laws of the administration are against the laws of the *Shariat* and it is the main duty of the legal practitioner to practise and apply it which is absolutely a sin.

(*c*) All the legal practitioners often simply for the existence of their profession have intentionally to work against the oppressed and in support of the oppressor, which is entirely tyranny and support of sin.

(*d*) In order to bring a case within the legal bounds, most of the legal practitioners intentionally give instructions and induce people to tell lies, which is a great crime. Many legal practitioners are obliged to ignore the commandments of God simply on account of the profession and become careless in the discharge of religious duties.

The reasons to boycott education in Government and semi-Government madrassas, colleges, and schools are as follows :

(*a*) The object of this education is either to serve Government or to become a legal practitioner which comes under the forbidden 'Mavalat'.

(*b*) Besides the above evil, the prevailing education and training lead to other evils such as the predominance of the love of worldly affairs, love for honour, worship of lust, negligence of, and carelessness towards, religion, etc., and all these things are *haram*. Therefore on the basis of 'the means of sin are sin' it is obligatory to refrain from getting and giving such education.

(*c*) The education in colleges and schools is the cause of failure to observe '*Farzeain*' (compulsory duty) as the necessary religious education which is essential for every Mussulman is generally impossible owing to the present system of education.

(*d*) In the Arabic madrassas which are under the control of the Government (whether wholly supported by the Government or partly or is only affiliated to its system) besides the above evils there is this evil that the religious education is only acquired for the sake of the wordly gain, which is *haram* according to the *Shariat*. In the same way the service of the teachers in these institutions is also *haram* as it is doubly sin (*Arabic verse*) 'God save us from this'.

Different reasons for the acceptance of grant-in-aid being *haram* :

(*a*) This is one of the means of '*Mavalat*' which is forbidden in the present condition.

(*b*) The real object of education disappears, leading to the above mentioned evils, therefore on the principle of (*Arabic verse*) 'What leads to sin is a sin' this acceptance is *haram*.

(*c*) Intense antagonism which it is obligatory to entertain against enemies of Islam disappear after acceptance of aid. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'O Prohpet wage jehad against the infidels and be hard on them. 'The Prophet's refusal to accept certain presents from the idolators is based upon this, as is explained in the *Fatwa Alamgiri*.

Honorary magistracy and honorary officers are *haram* for the following

reasons :

(*i*) These officers are a source of help to the Government of India, which is *haram*.

(*ii*) By virtue of these, decisions have to be given according to the laws of the Government of India which are totally against the laws of Shariat and which is *haram*. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'Those who give non-Shariat decisions are tyrants'.

(*iii*) One has to be slow and careless in discharge of religious duties very often owing to these officers.

To keep Government titles is *haram* for the following reasons :

(a) The titles are the means of the forbidden '*Mavalat*' Therefore to keep them comes under commandment of '*Mavalat*'.

(*b*) The title-holders have to respect and mix with officials (enemies of religion) which is *haram*.

(*c*) The title-holders beg respect and honour from the enemies of religion which is bad according to *Shariat*. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'People ask for respect at the hands of infidels; although all honour is in the hand of God'.

(*d*) The title-holder may be punctual in his prayers and fasting to any degree but he cannot remain hard upon the enemies of Islam which is a religious duty as mentioned above.

Answer no. 3. All the services of the Government from which it gets help are *haram* specially the police and the service in the army are the worst sin, as they have to fire upon their Muslim brothers. God Says (*Arabic verse*) 'Whoever intentionally kills a Mussulman will suffer eternally in hell'. The Prophet has said (*Arabic verse*) 'Whoever took up arms against Mussulmans is not from amongst us'. It is laid down in '*Mahsud Iman Sarkhasi*, Vol. X.' 'If a Kafir king is attacked by another Kafir king, in such circumstances it is not permissible for the Muslim subjects to fight for their Kafir king, because this would be splendour and grandeur of '*Shirk*' (idolatory) and *Kufr* to help which is *haram*.

Answer no. 4. It is certainly not permissible to buy goods from the enemies of Islam (British nation) or to sell goods to them, by which they may acquire strength. The respected law givers of Islam writing about the sale of arms to billigerent nations are 'not permissible' say that this commandment is not confined only to the arms, but the object is to make the sale of all such articles by which the enemies may acquire strength not permissible such as steel, etc.

Therefore, keeping the above noted argument in view the boycott of English goods is a religious duty, as at the present time the strength which our enemy acquires by trade is much more than that which they can acquire if steel were sold to them. But the use of such things, according to necessity, which it is not possible to avoid and which are indispensible for national purposes, is permissible, on the principle that 'if a man is pitched between two evils, he should choose the lesser one and also on the principle that necessity

are always turbulent and fanatical. They exhibit, we are told in the Malabar Gazetteer, childlike reverence for their own leaders and a great capacity of standing by one another. They are faithful and can be relied upon in emergencies.

They have been tried as troops in the Indian army, but the experiment was not a success. Recruits were drawn principally from the Ernad and Walluvanad taluks, where conditions have conduced to keep the Moplah poor, ignorant and fanatical, and not infrequently in the past enlistment was from the criminal classes. These facts are not without significance in view of the scene of the present disturbances and the military aptitude displayed.

Experience has shown that they are extraordinarily inflammable and when once they are aroused the one constant element is a desperate fanaticism. Surrender is unknown, the martyrs are consecrated before they go out and they are hymned after death.

Thus the Malabar District has always been a storm centre in Madras and the possibility of disturbances has never been absent from the minds of the local authorities. During the last two years on account of the non-cooperation movement combined with the Khilafat agitation the people have been exposed to a flood of violent oratory not only by local agitators but also by the leaders of the movement such as Gandhiji and the Ali Brothers. We have always been averse from setting in motion what is now called repressive legislation, and our general policy throughout India has been to rely on the ordinary law, and to trust to the ultimate victory of the good sense of the people. In some places we have agreed to the use of the Seditious Meetings Act, but His Excellency the Governor of Madras has explained in his announcement before the Madras Council the reasons of his Government's reluctance to take more severe precautionary measures. The reports have shown that the situation in Malabar was bad in April and May of this year—Hon'ble Members will perhaps recollect the inflammatory speeches delivered at Erode and Mangalore on the borders of the Malabar country—and an incident occurred in March which proved how easily the population of the Malabar coast can be roused into violence and how readily the well known fanaticism can be played upon by the political agitators. There was a disturbance in Cochin where the Christians supported by the low caste Hindus came into collision with the Mahommedans and the higher caste Hindus. A large body of Moplahs from Malabar was called in by theatter party to support them. Looting and incendiarism ensued and one Christian was killed. It was also reported that there were growing indications of incitement to fanatical outbreak—incitement coming from the local Khilafat Committee—the tour of the Ali Brothers and Gandhiji in the latter part of April left behind an aftermath of intensive activity and the Khilafat movement assumed a more definitely religious aspect. After that we were informed that the Ramzan was the quietest known for years in the Malabar district, and the excitement of the spring seemed to be dying down but towards the end of July the situation got repidly worse. A large number

37

AN OFFICIAL NOTE ON THE MOPLAH REBELLION

The Moplah community consists of pure Arab settlers, of the descendants of Arab traders and women of the country and of converts to Mahommedanism mainly from the lower Hindu castes. The first Mahommedan settlers were probably Arab traders who came to the East on the revival of trade interrupted by the period of Islamic conquest, but it is improbable that any converts were made much before 11th Century—but the Madazi Mosque appears to have been established in 1124 A.D. and at the date of Ibn Batuta's visit to Malabar in 1342 the Mophla's had attained a definite footing and some power in the land. I will not trace the history further, it is rather on their characteristics of turbulance and fanaticism that I wish to dwell.

In the early days of the last century there were frequent outbreaks which for the most part blazed out within a radius of some fifteen miles from Pandalur hill in the Erned taluk. The Arab strain, strong on the coast, is here very faint and the majority of the inland Moplahs are proselytes drawn from the dregs of the Hindu population. They are poor and ignorant and peculiarly susceptible to the inflammatory preaching of the church and militant and to alluring contrasts drawn between their miserable state here on eaeh and the wondrous joys of Paradise. The Moplah will brood over a fancied wrong till it assumes in his mind gigantic proportions and he feels that it can be washed out only in blood and he then determines to win eternal bliss by a martyr's death.

Between 1836 and 1853 no less than twenty-two outbreaks took place besides numerous abortive risings and conspiracies. Between 1855 and 1873 outbreaks still occurred but at longer intervals. There was an outbreak in 1885, in which twenty thousand arms were collected including nine thousand guns. Since then there have been I think four outbreaks, or five with this one but no outbreak in the past has been on the same scale, as the present which is clearly nothing less than organised rebellion. These outbreaks have in the past been attributed to three main causes; poverty, agrarian discontent and fanaticism, of which the last is probably the chief. Poverty is extreme in the fanatical zoneland is to some extent accentuated by the Moplah practice in the south of dividing up the property of the father among his wives, sons and daughters. The Tenants Improvements Act has done much to protect the tenant from ruinous eviction, and in the reports before us now there is nothing to show that agrarian discontent has played any part in the present outbreak. We have references to tenants' conferences in the earlier months of the year but we find them resolving to boycott such of the jenmies as have been aggressive towards them and to decline to ask Government for legislation in their favour. It must not be thought that the Moplahs

makes the forbidden permissible'.

Answer no. 5. It is certainiy permissible by the *Shariat* to have political (mulki) and social unity with such non-Muslim who is not at War with the Mussulmans. It is right to be just and equitable to them and also kind and benevolent towards them. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'God does not forbid you to do good and justice towards such infidels who did not fight a religious War against you and did not drive you out of your homes. God certainly loves those who are just'. But in the extreme enthusiasm of union which produces other evils is not permissible. In these matters this absolute rule of the religious law should be kept in view (*Arabic verse*) 'It is preferable to remove the evils than to put up with them for the sake of expediency and when evil and expediency coincide it is often preferable to eradicate the evil'. Because the *Shariat* gives more attention to preventing the commission of forbidden acts than to the performance of acts permitted. It is permissible by the *Shariat* to take help from such non-Muslims in religious matters. This proposition is mentioned in detail in the books of *Fiqa*, Chapter entitled 'The distribution of booty'. The Prophet in the Shirmishes of the Khyber took help from some Jews against the Jews. In the engagement at Hunain the Prophet sought the help of one Safiwan-ibn-Umayya who was as idolator. Its details are given in 'Fathul-Qadir, etc'.

Answer no. 6. It is permissible to accept and to act upon the good advice tendered by a non-Muslim which is not against the interest and expediency of religion. In fact this is in accordance with the orders of God and his Prophet. The law givers of Islam have considered it permissible to follow the leaders of idolators at the time of attacking an enemy during jihad. The Prophet said, 'Wisdom is the lost thing of a believer and he should take it from whoever he can get, there is no restriction about it.' But it is not permissible and is forbidden to follow the aspirations of idolators. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'If thou followed the aspirations of idolators after having knowledge of it, verily thou act as a tyrant'. But this should be remembered that it is not permissible for a Mussulman to be under the leadership of a non-Muslim whether wholly or partly. God says (*Arabic verse*) 'God has certainly not made a place for the infidels above the believers'. Other details are given in '*Tafsir Ahmadiya*' by Mulla Jiwan and others.

In the name of God the most compassionate and merciful.

The spreading of and acting upon the commandments of *Shariat* is essential for the Mussulmans which had been very well carried out by the learned answerer. May God give him the best reward.

Source : Home Dept. Pol. 1921, F. No. 137.

rebellion, but Hon'ble Members may be interested if I give them a brief summary of the military reports—narrating the events in barest outline and avoiding all descriptive rhetoric. On the 20 August 1921, the Officer Commanding, Calicut, proceeded at the request of the civil authorities with 100 men of the 1st Leinsters to support the search for arms and arrest the Moplah leaders at Tirurangadi. A small detachment of the Leinsters was sent to Malapuram and another small detachment was left behind at Calicut. The search for arms was a surprise and was successful but later in the day the magistrate's office was attacked by a body of armed Moplahs estimated at five thousand. The police station was attacked by two thousand Moplahs, who were beaten back by the fire of the police and troops. In the course of the fighting Lieutenant Johnson of the Leinsters and Mr. Rowley, A.S.P., were killed. The Moplahs were collecting in large numbers in the neighbouring villages and the column began to withdraw to Calicut with the prisoners who had been secured. The hired lorry driver was murdered. But while the police and troops were engaged at Tirurangadi, some Moplahs attempted to intercept their return by rail by attacking two railway stations, cutting telegraph wires and tearing up the track. The Malapuram detachment was cut off.

21 August.—It was now apparent that a rising on a large scale had occurred and control was placed in the hands of the military, and the General Commanding the Madras District ordered a complete moveable column and the remainder of the 2nd Dorset Regiment to be despatched from Bangalore by rail at once. Lt. Colonel Humphreys was put in command of the troops at Malabar. He was ordered to advance along the railway to Tirur as and when the damage to the line was repaired, his role being to support the police in restoring order. Later in the day, reports came in that the detachment was still held up at Malapuram and unable to return to Calicut, and that the railway line had been cut as far North as Kanawaldi and that large bands of Moplahs were reported at Tirur and Tanur.

On the 22nd in view of the imminent possibility of a Moplah rising in Calicut, the guard at West Hill was strengthened, the local auxiliary forces were called out and reinforcements from the 83rd Walajabad Light Infantry were sent from Cannanore. The Naval Commander-in-Chief was also asked to despatch a cruiser in order to co-operate off Calicut, and H.M.S. 'Comus' was sent.

On the 24th a force started for the relief of Malapuram from Calicut. This force was attacked at Pudokottur, a few miles from Malapuram by a large body of rebels about 11 O' clock on the 26th. The rebels were armed with carbines captured from the police stations they had looted, and with sporting rifles and swords and war knives. The District Magistrate in his report stated that they displayed their traditional ferocity and eagerness for death and after five hours' fighting were beaten. Their casualties were estimated at 400 killed. Two British soldiers were killed and an officer and five

without considerable risk of serious disturbances, namely an ineffectual, but awful, attempt by the police to effect certain arrest in connection with a case of house-breaking in the house of a certain Hindu landlord at Pookotur some miles North of Malapuram. A large and hostile crowd of Moplahs armed with swords including a number of their women folk, collected to prevent this arrest being carried out. The Police Inspector with his armed police force was intimidated and was in a serious danger for some time, until the crowd was persuaded by their own people to disperse. The incident was, however, significant, because it was regarded as a defeat for the police and therefore for the Government. In consequence as stated above additional troops were drafted into Malabar and the District Magistrate then ordered certain arrests to be made and certain action to be taken under the Moplah Outrages Act of 1884. The facts are best summarised in the communique issued by the District Magistrate himself.

'The District Magistrate had received information that a number of war knives were in existence in Tirurangadi in contravention of the Malabar Offensive Weapons Act, 20 of 1851. It was also necessary to arrest for incitement to outrage certain persons in Tirurangadi under section 8 of the Moplah Outrages Act. Anticipating that resistance would be made, a requisition was made for a detachment of British troops to support police, and party arrived at Tirurangadi before dawn on the 20th. Searches were made and three men arrested, and a small party of Reserve Police left behind to continue the search of warrantees. Kizhikkapalle Mosque was entered by Moplah Police Officers who removed their boots before entering the Mosque. Mampuron Mosque, which is off the other side of the river, was not approached by anybody between hours 11-30 and 2 P.M. Determined attack was made from two sides on the force of the Police and troops by armed bands, coming from Tanur, Parappanangadi and adjoining Amshoms on the West and from Tirurangadi and Amsoms on the coast as far as Ponmala and Kottakkal. The attacks were beaten off but two officers, Lieutenant Johnston and Mr. Rowley, A.S.P., were surrounded and butchered by the mob. The force stayed the night at Tirurangadi as at this time the railway station at Parappanangadi and thence alone the railway line to Feroke was being attacked constantly by armed Moplahs on the way for the first four miles. The railway lines had already been cut in several places as far as Feroke. This attempt to make searches and arrests under legal warrants in due conformity with law, has been the signal for an outburst of fanaticism throughout Ernad, Walluvanad and Ponani directed first against European officials and non-officials and latterly against Hindu Jenmis and others; public offices have been looted everywhere, Nanas and Kovilakoms pillaged, Hindus murdered and forcibly converted and the line cut to an extent regarding which there is no information.

Thus the rising had become a rebellion and was beyond the powers of the civil authorities to control. Full reports have appeared in the Press of the events which have taken place in the course of the suppression of this

of meetings was held throughout the Presidency and many in Malabar itself. Violent speeches were made at which resolutions confirming the All India Khilafat Committee's resolutions at Karachi were passed. One resolution threatened that if the British Government supported Greece as against Angora, the Mussulmans before that next Congress would adopt republican government for India. At another meeting on the 24th of July 1921, the audience was exhorted to be prepared to sacrifice body, soul and spirit for the sake of religion. At a later meeting on the 29 July, insistence was laid on the religious places being left intact according to the commandment of the Shariat, and it was resolved that unless this was done the Indian Mussulmans would not rest themselves, and would not allow the enemies of Islam and the Khilafat to rest. Such a resolution addressed to an audience of Moplahs constituted a distinct incitement to rebellion. Throughout the Malabar district at this time, that is, in the latter half of July and the early part of August, in consequence, it appears, of the Karachi Conference, violent Khilafat agaitation was proceeding and volunteers were being enrolled. The Madras Government in a letter written before, but received after the outbreak, wrote that the recent provocative speeches and the resolution of the Karachi Conference had produced an impression on the mind of the Moplah that Swaraj was at hand— Hon'ble Members will have seen reports in the Press that the Moplahs have openly boasted that Swaraj had been established and had flown the green flag. As a result of widespread propaganda they are better organised than in the past and better informed as to the strength of their position, and the difficulty of taking millitary action against them. But so far we had no indication of serious trouble. It was not till a later date, that is in a letter from Madras, dated 18 August that we received definite information that the situation in Malabar was causing grave anxiety. Reports had been received at the beginning of June that the local Khilafat agitators were enrolling volunteers who were dressed in uniform with the Khilafat badge and carried swords. It was subsequantly reported that the leaders had recognised the dangerous consequences of their action and had desisted from it; but more recent events prove that this estimate was mistaken and enabled the agitators to conceal their organisation while they were secretly strengthening it. The District Officer had reported that he needed more military support an on 11 August the Government of Madras warned the Military authorities that the situation amongst the Moplahs was becoming serious and that a further detachment of British troops would be required. The 1st Leinsters were ordered to reinforce their detachment at Calicut and the Bangalore Brigade to select and hold in readiness, an Indian Pioneer Battalion to move at short notice. On 14 August, the Madras Government asked that Calicut detachment should be reinforced upto a full company of 200 men. Three platoons of the 1st Battalion, Leinster Regiment, were despatched by rail on 14 August.

One event in particular caused the District Officer of Malabar to realise that the troops at his disposal were too few to enable him to enforce the law

men wounded. Mr. Lancaster, Assistant Superintendent of Police, was shot and has since died. From a military telegram it appears that the rebels attempted to ambush the Calicut column and fired from the front, rear and flank and that three other officers with the column were wounded. No graphic description of their action can yet be given, but it is clear that the fighting was of a very determined character and that the forces of the Crown were surprised by a large body of rebels far exceeding them in number.

On the 26th it was also reported that widespread robbery and violence directed against the Hindu population in Ernad and Walluvanad taluk, were continuing.

On the 30th Tirur-and the Malapuram moveable colum were due to effect a junction at Tirurangadi where it is reported the rebels were collected and determined to make a stand. On the 31st we received information that the junction had been effected and that no opposition had been received, that Calicut and the railway were quiet that small parties of the Moplahs were returning to their homes; that no support was any longer required on the west coast and that H.M.S. 'Comus' was leaving. On the 1st we learnt that the gradual resumption of railway traffic had been effected; that a party of rebels ensconced in a mosque sallied out to attack the troops at Tirurangadi but was mostly killed or captured. An important rebel was taken prisoner and one British soldiers was killed and four wounded. A column is now concentrating at Malipuram with a view to undertaking further operations. The back of the rebellion has now been broken after a few days' sharp fighting but some time must elapse before life can resume its normal aspect in the district. Bands of Moplahs have to be rounded up, communications restored, and the civil authority reasserted, but the civil and military authorities have the situation well in hand, and are taking all possible measures to restore order. The task of the Madras Government has been rendered more difficult by the occurrence of disorders at Madras and Karur and unrest and disaffection in some other districts.

If more is wanted to indicate the serious nature of the rising it has been supplied by the Press reports which have been to the best of my knowledge full and accurate. All the information we have received officially has been made over to the Press; we have kept back nothing and the Press have shown an equal desire to co-operate with us and I wish to express my gratitude to their representatives in Simla for their close and hearty co-operation with us which has been of the greatest assistance. In surveying these events I would ask Hon'ble Members to bear in mind.

(*a*) The wide extent of the rebellion : No less than six taluks have been affected and more than that its echoes have reached Madras, Karur and other districts of the Presidency;

(*b*) The careful and skilfull organization of the rebels : They have been well armed, they have shown skill in obstructing communications, cutting railway lines and closing roads. They have worn uniform with the Khilafat

badge and adopted military tactics and formation. We read of entrenchments and even explosive balls and they have been led by ex-sepoys. They have shown disregard for life and assembled in large numbers, from the very outset, and not as a mere rabble.

(*c*) The savage attacks on property and non-Muslims : We have no details yet as to the extent of the damage to property but all our information goes to show that it has been considerable. Government offices and treasuries have been looted, records burnt, temples sacked and private houses destroyed. We know that one British officer and three soldiers have been killed and one officer and twelve men wounded. Two European Assistant Superintendents of Police have been killed, one Inspector and two Head constables missing. One planter has been murdered and others had fortunate escapes. Reports state that numerous Hindus have been murdered and many forcibly converted to Islam. Hon'ble Members have perhaps seen the account of a horrible torture inflicted on an old lady of over 80, the mother of a member of the Calicut Municipality, and how the head of a retired Indian Inspector of Police was cut off and carried about on a spear. Amongst the Moplahs themselves we cannot say with accuracy what the casualities have been except at Pudakotur where 400 are said to have been killed though from Press reports they appear in all to be something like 1,000. On the administration the effect has been disastrous. The Civil Government for the time being collapsed, courts ceased to function, Government officials were in hiding; for a time there was something approaching a reign of terror; refugees, Indian and European, fled into Calicut and the local inhabitants were too terrified to undertake any material assistance to the authorities in quelling the rebellion. The economic results are likely to be serious. Famine conditions are apprehended and crops cannot be sown. "

The Government of Madras, faced with widespread rebellion, took the only step possible to restore the situation. Troops were called in; reinforcements have arrived from Bangalore and a sufficient body will remain until such time as the situation becomes more normal. The civil power was set at nought and there was therefore no other course open but to hand over control to the military authorities.

I will now give Hon'ble Members information which I feel they are anxious to have and which it is right that they should have in regard to the promulgation of an Ordinance declaring Martial Law. The facts I have mentioned provide ample justification for the issue of such an Ordinance. We received on the 22 August a telegram from the Madras Government stating that the situation was such that Martial Law should be proclaimed and asking that it should be introduced by Ordinance by the Governor General. We wired to Madras the possible alternative of continuing defactor Martial Law but said that the Government of India felt strongly that an Ordinance was the only satisfactory method of validating the proceedings of Summary Courts and providing for suitable methods of punishing acts which though not an

offence against the ordinary law are breaches of Martial Law or regulations and incompatible with the maintenance of order, for preventing improper or irregular punishment for breaches of military rules and for indemnifying officers for acts done in good faith and with reasonable belief that they were necessary for the performance of their duty. We also stated that orders would be issued to military officers by the Commander-in-Chief that the military officers must consult and keep in closest touch with the civil authorities. Finally we stated that it was essential that trials and punishments should be left as little as possible in the hands of military officers. The Madras Government agreed and the Ordinance which you have seen was promulgated on the 26th. It was extended to the four taluks of Walluvanad, Punani, Ernad and Calicut.

On the 27th we received a further telegram showing that the affected area included the Kurumbranad taluk which had been entered by large parties of Moplah rebels and that incursion into Wynad was threatened. The ordinance was accordingly extended to those two taluks. A question has been asked why the 19 August is the date notified as the date referred to in clause 7 (*b*) of the Ordinance when the District Magistrate's communique is dated the 20th and when it appears that it was on the 20th that the civil administration collapsed.

I will take Hon'ble Members into my confidence. We notified the date as the 19 August because in a telegram dated the 24 August the Madras Government in reply to telegram from us asking what the date should be, stated that it should be the 19 August. This date applies to the four taluks first notified. It will be observed that the District Magistrate's communique describing the events of the 20th had not been seen by us when we received the Madras Government's telegram of 24th. The date which applies to the taluks of Kurumbranad and Wynad is the 24 August.

Finally, I want to assure Hon'ble Members that we have taken steps to ensure that Martial Law shall be administered according to the principles and standards of conduct laid down by the Secretary of State in his despatch of the 26 May 1920. I have already briefly mentioned the safeguards provided in regard to close co-operation between the civil and military authorities and necessity, as far as possible, of appointing only fairly senior military officers to positions of responsibility in the administration of Martial Law and to the advisability of entrusting the trial of cases to civil magistrates.

Hon'ble Members are perhaps aware that as a result of the Hunter Report and some of the unfortunate events which occurred during the administration of Martial Law in the Punjab we have framed instructions to military officers and also to civil officers relating to Martial Law. Those instructions are confidential but I may tell Hon'ble Members that they have been circulated widely to senior military officers and to all civil officers of and above the rank of a District Magistrate. I will read to the Council some selections from those instructions which will I think prove to Hon'ble Members

that we are fully alive to the importance of observing those principles and standards of conduct to which I have referred.

Source: Home Dept. Pol. 1921, F. No. 241.

38

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE KHILAFAT CONFERENCE, KARACHI

8 July 1921

(1) This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference declares allegiance of the Muslim population to His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey, the Commander of the Faithful, and gives him an assurance that they would not rest content until they had secured complete fulfilment of the Khilafat demands.

(2) It records its sorrow at the death of Jan Mahomed who had led the Hijrat movement and sends its condolence to his family.

(3) It further congratulates those workers in Sind who have undergone imprisonment in the cause of their religion and country and hopes that their efforts will meet with success.

(4) This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference declares that so long as the demands of Indian Muslims regarding the integrity of the Khilafat and the preservation of the sanctity of Jazirut-ul-Arab and other Holy Places which are based upon their religious canons are not fulfilled, neither shall they rest in peace nor shall they leave it to the enemies of Islam; that the entire provinces of Thrace and Smyrna shall form the indissoluble components of the territories of the Turkish Sultan as they used to be before the War, and in no part of them shall Muslims tolerate the influence and interference of Greek or any other Power. The Muslims shall never agree to the conditions the Allies wish to impose upon the Turkish Government, or on its military, naval and air forces, or in connection with the financial, economic or judicial administration, as that would tend to interfere with the complete independence of the Khilafat and the Sultanate. This Conference calls upon local committees to make fresh declarations to the above effect so that no doubt be left as to the religious obligation of the Muslims.

(5) Whereas Mesopotamia contains holy places, such as the burial places of the descendants of the Prophet and holy saints, and is in addition an integral

part of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the influence, residence or entrance of non-muslim nationals without the authority of Islamic Powers is not permissible by religion and in case a colonisation of the above character comes about it would conflict with their holy Shariat. The Mussulmans are convinced that the Armenians would take advantage of their nearness to the Holy Places and revive their old enmities towards Islam. This Conference therefore demands that the above country be immediately vacated.

THE ARMY AND INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION

(6) The sixth resolution was to the effect that it permits the Central Khilafat Committees to send out emissaries to other Muslim countries to educate the people there, make them alive to their present position and promote the Islamic brotherhood.

That this meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference congratulates Gazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his Government on the courage and suffering they have put up to save Islam and prays that they may be able to drive the foreigners out of Turkish territory. It further declares unlawful for any faithful to serve from today in the army or help or acquiesce in their recruitment. It further decides that if the British Government directly or indirectly, openly or secretly, fights the Angora Government, the Muslims of India will start civil disobedience and establish their complete independence at the next session of the Indian National Congress to be held at Ahmedabad and hoist the flag of the Indian Republic.

(7) This meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference calls upon all local Khilafat Committees to devise measures to absolutely stop drinking within their districts, and congratulates the workers and volunteers of places where the liquor traffic has diminished and further commends to them to put forth their best efforts to achieve greater success.

(8) That this meeting of the All India Khilafat Conference calls upon all Provincial, District and Village Committees to put forth their last efforts to enlist a crore of Khilafat members and collect 40 lakhs of rupees to relieve the distress in Smyrna and aid the Muhajirin Relief Fund.

(9) This Conference strongly appeals to the Pirs and Zamindars of Sind to take more interest in the Khilafat movement than they had done hitherto and requests the former to command their disciples to do the same.

OTHER RESOLUTIONS

This Conference strongly condemns the repression inaugurated by the Government of the Frontier Province in its various districts such as Kohat and Bannu, its policy of imprisoning Khilafat workers and organizers and refusing admission to the students of the National Muslim University for collection of funds.

This Conference congratulates Sirdar Sardul Singh Cavassieur of Lahore on the great suffering he has patiently borne in the cause of his religion and

country and further condemns the mischievous attempts of the Government to create disunion among the Sikh community.

This Conference appeals to all people to take to the spinning wheel and wear Khaddar leaving the mill-made cloth for the use of the poor, while sending out their clothes, made out of foreign articles, for the use of sufferers in Smyrna. It appeals to them to carry out effectively this new step of the non-cooperation programme, and secondly, appeal as to women to discard foreign cloth and thus remove the cause of the nation's poverty.

Source : Indian Annual Register, 1922.

38

TELEGRAM FROM THE GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY TO THE VICEROY

28 August 1921

Mr. Billimoria, the head of a well-known firm of Chartered Accountants in Bombay, has reported confidentially that on the 19th Shaukat Ali visited him in connection with Khilafat accounts for which his firm are auditors and complained, in view of public criticism regarding the misappropriation of Khilafat funds, of the firm's delay in certifying audit. Mr. Billimoria refused to certify unless vouchers for the sum of two and a half lakhs of expenditure were produced. Shaukat Ali then took him into his confidence and said (1) that owing to this sum having been spent on bribing Indians Army vouchers could not be produced; (2) that at meeting soldiers at Rawalpindi had many men kissed his hands and that Army had sworn to follow him; (3) that he was determined to proclaim a republic on October 1st or January at the latest; (4) that plans were to raid military quarters for arms and ammunition and to shoot down all Europeans. There is, I think, no doubt as to authenticity of reports but that Shaukat Ali to have taken a loyal Parsee so completely into his confidence is scarcely conceivable, and in any case the sum of Rs. 2½ lakhs would not go for to bribe Army. Billimoria explains this in saying Shaukat Ali was very excited and unguarded and had lost his temper. It is possible, of course, that Shaukat Ali had some ulterior design in all this but in view of authenticity of report and integrity of informant I think it would be repor-

ting privately to you. The firm continues to refuse to sign audits and refuse to throw up job which Shaukat Ali suggested they should do as an alternative.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political, File No. 155, 1922.

39

DEMI-OFFICIAL LETTER FROM C.A. BORRON CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF DELHI, TO H.D. CRAIK, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Delhi, 2 September 1921

In my fortnightly report for the second half of August I have referred to the serious state of ill-feeling which is being worked up among the lower class Mahommedans in Delhi over the confiscation of the fatwa leaflet, and said I was submitting a more detailed report.

2. During the second half of June and July, as already reported in my diaries, we had constant political meetings devoted chiefly to non-cooperation, the establishment of ward panchayats under the Congress scheme for a 'national' system of administration, and in preparation for the boycott of English cloth to start from the 1st August. A few of the worst speakers at these meetings were being marked down for prosecution or action under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code or the Penal Code, on a suitable opportunity arising. This assiduous organization of political meetings since the Seditious Meetings Act expired, had, of course, prepared for ground for further excitement, which has been supplied by the religious turn given to the agitation since the confiscation of the proscribed leaflet early in August.

3. The local Jamiat-ul-Ulema at once telegraphed to Gandhiji for permission to start civil disobedience, but he counselled doing nothing in a hurry. Several private meetings of the local Maulvis were held at which it was decided to refer the question of further action to the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind for advice and orders. The first big public meeting on the subject was held on the evening of the 23rd August at Pataudi House. It is reported that there was more religious enthusiasm among the Mahommedans at this meeting than had been witnessed since the Ulemas' Conference last November. A very great crowd assembled, amongst whom a fairly strong fanatical element was observed. The leading speakers were Maulvi Syed Hussian Ahmed Madni, Mahajar of Deoband, who presided, Maulvi Ahmed Syed of Delhi, Maulvi Ibrahim of Sialkot, and Mufti Kifaitullah of Delhi. The president in a lengthy address lasting nearly two hours reviewed the various occasions in the last 200 years

when Christian powers had been opposed to Islam. Ahmed Syed emphasised the view that the proscribed fatwa as prepared by nearly 500 Maulvis was an abstract of the orders of God and the Prophet and its confiscation would not be tolerated; the question of disobedience of the order had been referred to the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind, and if they ordered disobedience, non-violence would have to cease and the responsibility for bloodshed would rest on the Government and on those who had not informed Government of the gravity of the situation; Pharaoh was no more, and the Czar had been shot by his own men; if people asked why they should help that Turks now when they had not helped the Mahommedans of India in 1857 the answer was that the Turks were themselves in difficulties at that time. Kifaitullah said he had been asked by many zealous Mahommedans why they were sitting silent when God's orders had been proscribed, but he had pacified them by saying the matter had been referred to the Jamiat-i-Hind. A local firebrand named Anwar Beg objected to waiting for any such decision and began to talk of Jihad, on which shouts of Allah-ho-Akbar came from the crowd, and the speaker was made to stop by Ahmed Syed. The resolutions passed at the meeting were :

(*i*) This meeting of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema of Delhi condemns the action of the Government of Delhi of proscribing the fatwa of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind by the police and views it as a great insult to Islam and the Ulemas and expresses its deep indignation against it and requests the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind to call its meeting immediately and let them know what course they should follow.

(*ii*) This meeting congratulates Arif Hussain, M. Nisar Hussain of Cawnpore and other patriots, who are in jail, for the sake of their religion and country on their merits and prays God to enable them be firm in their intentions.

(*iii*) The copies of the resolutions passed to be sent to the newspapers for general information.

4. Another large gathering of Mahommedans attended a meeting held on the evening of the 26th August at the same place. This was to have been a meeting about the sufferings of the Moplahs, but its object was changed by the presence of Abul Kalam Azad. The chair was taken by M. Sanaullah of Amritsar. The principal speaker was Abul Kalam Azad, who upbraided the people of Delhi for not discarding foreign clothes and adopting Khaddar, and said he judged from this they would be lukewarm in getting the order proscribing the fatwa cancelled; he was prepared to repeat what the fatwa contained and challenged Government to arrest him; more training in bearing hardships was needed before general civil disobedience could be introduced, but this order confiscating the fatwa must be disobeyed and he advised having it printed and everyone getting and distributing copies; a meeting of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind would soon be held at which the most suitable way of disobeying this interference with their religion would be declared. Maulvi Murtaza Hussain

of Chandpur, Bijnor, said that after the Khilafat and Swaraj Government had now put the Koran in jail, the Mahommedans would go there to fetch it out. A Maulvi, Muhammad Fakhir of Allahabad, referred to his experiences in Jail, and exhorted disobedience of the order and the wearing of swadeshi clothes. A Maulvi, Muhammad Ibrahim of Junagarh, brought tears to the eyes of his audience by describing the destruction of Islam. Ahmed Syed said some of the Maulvis had brought copies of the fatwa for distribution but he had persuaded them to await the decision of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind; foreign clothes should be tabooed so that Government should not have enough money to pay her police and her army; conflicts should be avoided so that Government's stock of ammunition might be preserved till they needed it themselves to protect their country; the order of the confiscation of the fatwa must be disobeyed and men would be sent round distributing it wearing Korans round their necks through which they would have to be shot if the police fired on them. At the end of the meeting Kifaitullah (who was now in the chair) took an oath from the audience to discard all foreign clothes by the end of September.

The resolutions passed were :

(*i*) To condemn the action of the Government of Delhi of proscription of the Fatwa and to declare it unbearable and to request Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind to decide finally what course they should follow.

(*ii*) To wear *garha* and do away with foreign cloth up to 30th September 1921 for the sake of the freedom of the country and to request the merchants not to ask for assistance from the Government against the movement, otherwise they would also need deputing volunteers at their shops.

In the middle of this meeting there was a disturbance caused by an assault on a man wearing a Fez who was seen taking notes and was wrongly suspected of being a C.I.D. man. He was rescued by some volunteers.

5. These abstracts give I am afraid but a slight idea of the effect of the speeches on the illiterate audiences, whose feelings are reported to have been deeply stirred. The effect of the meetings on the lower classes of the City population generally has been altogether bad and a feeling of unrest has been created among the public. A few more such meetings may any day result in an outrage or explosion of an anti-European character. There are bound to be a number of fanatics among such gatherings. The local police take a very serious view of the situation which has now arisen. After the last meeting a secret conference between Abul Kalam Azad and a few selected Maulvis decided that the course of action to be adopted was to arrange for the public distribution of thousands of copies of the fatwa, the Ulemas having taken a vow that they will not keep silent until the Delhi order of confiscation is cancelled.

6. The religious turn that has been given to the agitation renders it the

more difficult to deal with. It practically precludes the use of section 144 Criminal Procedure Code, to forbid such meetings, as the cry of interference with religion would be at once raised. If the order were disobeyed of a meeting the dispersal without extreme measures would be impossible. Action against individual speakers here would also not be successful. It is evident that fresh speakers could be readily obtained from far and near, most of the prominent speakers at these meetings having been outsiders. I am informed that the local Jamiat-ul-Ulema has been in the last few days receiving several enquiries from similar associations elsewhere asking what they were doing in the matter, and threatening, if nothing is done, to come here and take action themselves to defy the order.

7. The leaflet has now, under the instructions of the Government of India, been proscribed by, I think, all the local Governments. But Delhi is, so far as I know, the only place where we have found a quantity of the leaflets and confiscated them. The first thing to do, it seems to me, is for Government to issue as soon as possible a statement explaining that the document proscribed was not the fatwa prepared by the Ulemas' Conference of last November (the Conference we know was a packed one, though it may not be politic to say so), but an abstract evidently prepared for political purposes as the most important item in it was the suggestion that it was unlawful for a Mahommedan to join or remain in the army or the police, and the abstract was being widely distributed among the army. No Government could be expected to stand by and witness these attempts to tamper with the loyalty of its troops without taking steps to stop them, but this involves no interference with the Mahommedan religion, in which respect Government has no intention of departing from its well-known long-standing policy. The distinction between the fatwa and the abstract is rather a fine one to draw without leaving the impression that we are prepared to accept anything that may be descri[illegible]d [illegible] fatwa, but Government's Mahommedan advisers may be able to indicate the line to take. Some pronouncement of this nature seems, however, absolutely necessary to remove the doubts that this outcry is calculated to raise even among loyal Mahommedan adherents of Government.

8. The next thing which requires early decision is the action to be taken regarding the proposed meeting of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind. We do not of course know yet whether the general body will endorse the proposals of the local malcontent Maulvis, and possibly other events may in the meantime distract their attention. But I think we may take it as certain that a considerable gathering of disaffected men, with perhaps little or no claims to be regarded as religious leaders but all the more vociferous on that account, can easily be collected at very short notice. In today's newspapers I see that this all-India Conference has been invited for the 15th and 16th instant. In this notice it is significant that the word Jihad is introduced; ostensibly the theory is merely propounded that the form of Jihad suitable at present is the rendering of assistance to Angora. But it would be interesting to know

whether the use of the word is prompted by a desire to keep the idea before the public mind, or because it was felt that the idea had already been so worked up that it was politic to indicate a plausible outlet. However that may be, the situation is quite different from that of last November, when I had to ask the Government of India to consider the advisability of preventing such a concourse. Now the gathering will consist to a still greater extent of the more fanatically inclined religious men, and they will come to consider only one subject the best way in which to defy authority with the proscription of the fatwa leaflet as the raison d'etre of their attitude. It is a matter for very serious consideration whether any means available for preventing such a gathering in Delhi of fanatics from all over India with its immense potentialities for serious mischief should not be adopted.

9. In their last letter about the Seditious Meeting Act [no. 993-Home (Political), dated the 7th June 1921] the Government of India said they would be prepared to reconsider the question of further extending the Act if necessity for its reapplication arose. Though there has fortunately so far been no outbreak of disorder, I think I have said enough to show that, as the Deputy Commissioner puts it, events have been moving very fast in the last few days and that a very grave situation has arisen which justifies me in asking for authority to introduce the Act for another period of six months if any more dangerous meetings take place or are planned. If better counsels prevail among the general body of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind than the efforts of the local branch give one any grounds for anticipating, the authority would of course be held in abeyance. But I trust the Government of India will now be pleased to authorise me to bring the Act into effect without delay should there be any further attempts to work upon the passions of the lower class Mahommedan population of the city. So far the Act has always been obeyed, but it is possible, especially if there were delay in applying the remedy after one or two more meetings, that in the then state of feeling, defiance of the Act might be the form of civil disobedience selected to bring matters to a head. In that case we would have to be guided by circumstances, but the general line of policy should I think be (1) not to attempt to disperse a meeting by force, but to allow it to finish, and subsequently to arrest and prosecute the organisers and principal speakers, (2) hostile demonstrations would have to be dealt with as and when they arose. The prosecution under the Act of a gathering of Ulemas assembled under a religious guise might be a ticklish matter, and it would be far better if the gathering could be prevented altogether.

Similarly if (3) any broadcast distribution of the proscribed leaflet is attempted, I do not propose to instruct the police to interfere and attempt to capture the leaflets or arrest the distributors. The remedy under the Press Act is to forfeit the security of the Press and prosecute the publishers, if they can be discovered.

10. In conclusion I should add that in consultation with the General Officer Commanding, Delhi Brigade Area, certain precautions have been taken

to meet the existing situation and the other eventualities that may be expected in the next few days, which are adequate so far as our present information shows.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political, 1921, F. No. 137.

40

GANDHIJI'S SPEECH AT TRICHINOPOLY AFTER THE ARREST OF MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI

20 September 1921

I know that you are all sorry that Maulana Muhammad Ali is not to-night in midst nor is Begum Saheba.... I have no doubt that the Mussulmans of this place understand exactly what their duty is by Islam and their country....... Theirs is a name to conjure with among the Mussulmans and they have found an abiding place in the hearts of millions of Hindus and Mussulmans. They stand, as no Mussulman have stood, for Hindu-Muslim unity.... I ask both Mussulmans and Hindus not to be irritated but remain calm and firm in their determination to vindicate the honour of their religion and their country.

I know that what has happened in Malabar.... My heart bleeds to think that our Moplah brethren have gone mad. I am grieved to find that they have killed officers. I am grieved to think that they have looted Hindu Houses leaving many hundred of men and women homeless and foodless. I am grieved to think that they have endeavoured forcibly to convert Hindus to Islam.... Their acts are not the acts of all the Muslims of India even nor thank God, of all the Moplahs. Every Mussulman of note that I know has repudiated, every one of their acts. Let our loyalty to Hindu-Muslim unity therefore remain firm and changeless...there is nothing in Islam to warrant any of the things that these misguided Moplahs have done and so long as we are satisfied as I am satisfied that no sensible Mussulman approves of these acts....

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political, Proceeding, 1921, F. No. 303.

41

LETTER FROM T. B. SAPRU, LAW MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL TO SIR WILLIAM VINCENT

9 Octobe1 1921

I have given my most anxious thought to the question as to whether we should take any steps against Mr. Gandhi and his associates Maulana Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali who has issued this Manifesto. I have read the Manifesto and also the Trichinopoly speech. I do not wish to underrate or minimise the danger of the attitude taken by Mr. Gandhi and his friends with particular reference to Army.

The question as to whether we should arrest and prosecute him is not so much a question of choice between two evils—the evil of prosecuting him now and the evil of letting him alone for the present. During the last twelve months or so, his influence has extended over a much larger area than perhaps we can realise. The masses may not understand exactly the full significance of his propaganda or the meaning of the *Swaraj*, but he has eminently been successful in exploiting their discontent. He is not a mere politician in the eyes of the masses. He has all the sanctity of a holy man attached to him, and therein has, to my mind, the secret of his hold and also the danger of it.

While it is true that the prosecution of Mr. Gandhi or others will strike terror into the hearts of many people, or ought not to lose sight of the fact that the temper of the people today is very different from what it was in 1919 and that the steady defiance of law and authority during the last two years has emboldened people to a much greater degree than at any previous time. Jail has lost its terrors for most of these people, and imprisonment, so far from involving any social disgrace, is now looked upon as the hallmark of patriotism. I think it would be a great mistake to suppose that the removal of Mr. Gandhi and others into jail would sound the death-knell of his movement. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is bound to give a fresh lease of life to agitation and to feed it by supplying fresh material. The prosecution of Mr. Gandhi or his imprisonment will not affectively suppress the cry either for the *Swaraj* or for the revision of the Turkish Treaty.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, Political, 1921, F. No. 303.

42

GANDHIJI'S MESSAGE AT THE ARREST OF MAULANA MUHAMMAD ALI

He (Muhammad Ali) and I were going to address a meeting outside the station at Waltair. He was arrested. I continued going to the meeting and addressed them.

There is no cause for sorrow, but every cause for congratulation. There should be no hartal. Perfect peace and calmness should be observed. I regard the arrest as a prelude to *Swaraj* and the redress of Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs if we can remain non-violent. Retain Hindu-Muslim Unity despite the madness of some Moplahs, and fulfil the Swadeshi programme.

By striving like the Maulana, be insistant on religious and national rights. Let us earn imprisonment. I am conscious of the Maulanas innocence and I am sure the imprisonment of the innocent will enable the nation to reach the cherished goal.

Source : The Bombay Chronicle, September 1921.

43

RESOLUTION PASSED IN A MEETING OF JAMAAT-UL-ULEMA, BOMBAY

This meeting of the Ulema of the Bombay Presidency expresses its sorrow and grief at the arrest of the Ali Brothers and Dr. Kitchlew, and in view of the Government announcement showing the grounds on which they are arrested, deems it necessary to declare that the Ali Brothers, Dr. Kitchlew and others in placing the Resolution before the Karachi Khilafat Conference did nothing but to place the clear injunctions of the Holy Quran, and their arrest on the ground is a direct interference in the Islamic Religion. This meeting while urging upon all Mussulmans to remain firm and resolute with perfect peace and order, assures them that the Ulema fully realize their religious responsibilities and will keep them informed from time to time what the commandments of *Shariat* enjoins upon them under all circumstances.

Source : The Bombay Chronicle, September 1921.

44

GANDHIJI'S MESSAGE TO THE MUSSULMANS OF INDIA AT THE ARREST OF ALI BROTHERS

Whilst the arrest of Maulana Shaukat Ali and Mahomed Ali has launched every Indians heart, I know what it has meant to you. The brave brothers are staunch lovers of their country, but they are Mussulman first and everything else afterwards. It must be so with every religious-minded man. The brothers have for years past represented all that is best and noblest in Islam. No two Mussulmans have done more than they to raise the status of Islam in India. They have promoted the cause of the Khilafat as no two other Mussulmans of India have. For they have been true, and they dared to tell what they felt even in their internment in Chhindwada. Their long internment did not demoralise or weaken them. They came out just as brave as they went.

And since their release from internment, they have shown themselves true nationalist, and you (*sic*) have taken pride in their being so.

We must remain non-violent, but we must not be passive. We must repeat the formula of the Brothers regarding the duty of soldiers and invite imprisonment...we must declare from a thousand platforms, that it is sinful for any Mussulman or Hindu to serve the existing government whether as soldier or in any other capacity whatsoever.

Source : Home Department, 1921, F. No. 303 (Simla Records).

45

SAROJINI NAIDU ON THE ARREST OF ALI BROTHERS

I entreat the people of Bombay to meet this grave hour of our national crisis in a spirit of unbroken courage and fortitude and to offer them the tribute of our love and sorrow not by instituting futile hartals and processions but by faithfully maintaining inviolate the integrity of the great ideal of non-violence and peace, even under the severest provocation in accordance with the Congress mandate, the injunction of Mahatma Gandhi, and the express desire and command of the Ali Brothers themselves.

It is our sacred duty and privilege to shoulder the task as they have left unfulfilled and to consecrate all our thoughts, energies and endeavours to the establising of *Swaraj* and the righting of the *Khilafat* and the *Punjab Wrongs*, with invincible faith and determination.

Source : The Bombay Chronicle, September, 1921.

46

ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE

Ahmedabad, 26 December 1921

The All-India Khilafat Conference was held at Ahmedabad, in the Muslim League Pandal, on the 26th December 1921. The attendance, even from circles outside the Moslem faith, was very large, and included almost all the prominent N.C.O. leaders. Syed Ahmed Ali Alvi, Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the delegates in his speech deploring the present condition of India and the tyrannies she was suffering and asked the Mahommedans whether they could rest content when the *fatwas* of their religious Heads were being proscribed by the Government.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Hakim Ajmal Khan President of the All-India Khilafat Conference, delivered his presidential address in Urdu in which he reviewed the present political situation in the country and discussed the question of the Khilafat in the light of developments in India and the near East. He began by saying that it was a sheer waste of time to deliver a long presidential speech and that it was futile to dwell on the different phases of the present struggle which are obvious to all. He remarked that since the last Khilafat Conference at Karachi*, great changes had taken place in the European diplomacy in the near East, and other Islamic countries had been repeatedly defeated thus bringing us nearer to our goal. If we devoted our best energies to the work, the final achievement is not far. He pointed out that Islamic

* The famous Karachi Conference where the Ali Brothers delivered the historic speech calling upon their Moslem comrades to come out of the British Army. At the famous Karachi State Trial for sedition which followed, the Government sent six of the foremost Moslem Leaders of India, including the Alis, to gaol for taking part in the Conference and for their alleged disloyalty.

federation in Central Asia, Caucasia, Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan, and, above all, the regenerated Turkey gave promise of a greater future for Islam. India on the one side and Asia Minor on the other are but two extreme links in a chain of the future Islamic federation, which are gradually but surely joining together all intermediate states in one great system. The present condition in Europe clearly indicate the great possibility of the emancipation of Asia from the political bondage and economic slavery of the West. In India the work had already begun. He asked his compatriots deeply interested in the events taking place outside India to bear in mind these facts that the success of their efforts in the cause of the Khilafat question, was bound to help the awakening of India and that the regeneration of Asia was closely bound up with the Khilafat question, in as much as, it was, as a matter of fact, the forerunner of a general awakening of Asia. United India could not afford to ignore the developments in the Islamic world, specially because no less than seventy millions belonging to the Islamic faith from part of the Indian nation and had a share in its destiny. Afghanistan, the neighbouring Islamic country touching on our border, was already making efforts to attain complete independence which will certainly checkmate the designs of imperialistic greed and would clear the way for other Asiatic states to rise.

ANGLO-AFGHAN TREATY

Referring to the recent Anglo-Afghan Treaty, the President remarked that it was the first step towards a complete vindication of the natural and political honour of the Afghan. All that could possibly be said against the treaty was that it was perhaps not well timed and that the Indian people would have approved a further postponement. But, on the whole, the treaty was an admirable and a statesman like achievement on the part of His Majesty the Amir and his Ministers. The Afghan nation deserves to be congratulated mainly because the treaty was, if any thing, a clear guarantee of a complete independence in the near future. Alongwith the recent consolidation of the Islamic states in Azerbaijan, Caucasia and Persia is as significant as the great victory of the Kemalist forces over the Greeks, which completely smashed the British diplomacy in the East and induced France to conclude a separate treaty with Angora, thus undermining the alliance and at the same time giving an impetus to the efforts of those who stood for right and justice.

NEAR EASTERN QUESTION

He described what intense efforts were being made to dissuade France from the Franco-Turk agreement and to spoil prospects of peace, but it was not too much to hope that France would not commit such a mistake because it was well-known that she was absolutely disgusted with the cross currents of European diplomacy and the sordid machination of Allied foreign offices in her own interests and also in the interest of peace and order, and to dissociate herself from diplomatic intrigues leading to the world's difficulties. Even the

French Press declared that it was not so very difficult to solve the near Eastern question if only Great Britain would care to help.

The President hoped that, after all, France would not fall a victim to the intrigues of British Imperialism. It was a pity that the British ministers were found lacking in statesmanship and political foresight and relied simply on their diplomacy which only weakened the alliance, so much so, that even Italy with hardly any sympathy for the Turks and always their enemy began to turn round and join hand with the Kemalist. It would not be long before she, too, like France, concluded a separate treaty with Angora. In spite of the British efforts to camouflage the real issue by slightly revising or amending the treaty of Sevres, Great Britain could not afford to ignore the world-wide unrest which had affected adversely the prestige of the British Empire. The world now understood the diplomatic tricks which are the stock in trade of the British imperialism. The British ministers used to assert that they were prepared to do justice to the Turks but that they could not take any action alone and were in honour bound to respect the alliance. Now that out of the three allied powers France had already concluded a separate peace and Italy was actively sympathising with the Turks, who was there to oppose a complete revisions of the treaty of Sevres ?

NATIONALIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

Turning to questions arising out of the Nationalist movement in India, the President remarked that the present struggle between the bureaucracy and the people of India was a striking demonstration of brute force against moral force. The effect was very significant that was adding to the moral courage of a suffering people who were gaining in strength and vitality with every fresh exhibition of repression by the Government.

DISORDERS IN BOMBAY

Referring to the recent disorders in Bombay, the President pointed out that they were initiated mainly by a few unscrupulous and ignorant men, who were never connected with the non-cooperation movement. But the sad events of Bombay had a silver lining. It did ones heart good to see that throughout the country the spirit of non-violence, the basic principle of the movement, had found a place in the hearts of the people, and they were found to be sufficiently trained and organised to stand any amount of repression and sufferings without giving way to violence. The true spirit had permeated the masses, and it could now be declared with great confidence that, as far as this movement was concerned the possibility of public disorder or violence hardly existed. This was the greatest guarantee of their ultimate success. Immediately after the disorders in Bombay the bureaucracy lost its head and Lord Reading failed to grasp the situation. He took a wrong turn and precipitated further difficulties. It was an irony that the very Government who wanted to keep the Prince above politics proved to be the sole cause of

placing his Royal Highness in a false and awkward position. The bureaucracy with its stage-managing wanted to utilise the Royal visit in its own way. But, in its profound wisdom, it took a false step, and to the great regret of the people of India placed the Prince in a vortex of political struggle. They tried to suppress the legitimate feelings of the people and only succeeded in intensifying the movement. Now that a full measure of repression had already been tried and prisons were full, the Viceroy came out with a concession that he was perplexed and could not understand the movement. Even now, he did not realise that the very diagnosis on which he relied was wrong and that therefore the treatment must fail. The Government miserably blundered, when, instead of prosecuting and banishing individual offenders, they declared all associations unlawful. This was a challenge thrown out to all national movements and activities, and Nationalists could not afford to ignore it. They took it up and began to fill up the jails in an absolutely non-violent manner and spirit. It was futile, said the President, to repeat the decisions of what was happening. But it should be pointed out that even the religious tolerance of which the bureaucracy talked so much had exploded. After the Karachi Conference we knew what religious tolerance amounted to. It is, according to the official interpretation, subservient to the considerations of policy and administration. That was all.

The President then summed up with the remark that non-violence and the capacity for suffering were the two essentials. They were the key to success. Every Nationalist should consider it his duty to go to jail and to suffer for the sake of right and justice and should religiously observe the basic principle of non-violence.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE

Referring to the suggestions about the Round Table Conference and the speech recently delivered by Lord Ronaldshay, the President was disappointed to see that the bureaucratic notions about an unlimited prestige and power were still the guiding factor. He remarked that there were few men in the country indeed who could not be misled by the so-called conciliatory speeches which is full of futile threat and platitudes about law and order. We, too, wanted peace, but only by safeguarding our citizen rights and national honour.

Referring to the Liberal Party and the Moderates, the President declared that recent political developments were making us all very uneasy and we should not forget that most of those belonging to the Liberal Party were honest Nationalists. Whatever their views, their motives should not be doubted. They had quite a long experience of the reforms. Apart from those who may have joined the Government for the sake of personal gain, most of the Moderates deserve respectful attention. He said that he had not given up all hope, and believed that sooner or later the Moderates would join hands with the Nationalists. It was not right to run down honest patriots

merely on account of difference of opinion or methods.

Likewise, said the President, we should have no ill-will towards the police or the army. They too are not beyond our hope. He next appealed to all Nationalist workers to treat the policeman or soldiers with tolerance and make allowances for their weaknesses and defects.

Regarding the Moplah disorders in Malabar, the President said that he was very much grieved to see that the brave Moplahs transgressed the commandments of Islam by resorting to forcible conversion. But fortunately there were only a few who had committed such misdeeds, the majority of the brave people was goaded into armed rebellion by an extremely highhanded administration. Our sympathies should be with all sufferers, whether Moplahs or Hindus. In this connection he referred to the inhuman atrocities committed there under the Martial Law, and the railway van tragedy. Had the Government allowed the Nationalists to enter the disturbed area, much suffering would have been prevented and he thought that peace would have been easily restored.

In the end the President appealed to the Mussulmans of India to carry on the present struggle with increasing energy and fortitude, never forgetting that they must always take their stand on the bed rock of non-violence and love and truth.

After the Presidential Address a resolution of allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey was passed, all standing.

RESOLUTIONS

ON CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

The All-India Khilafat Conference resumed its sitting on the same evening to pass resolutions. It was resolved to appeal to all Muslims to enroll as volunteers and civilly disobey order prohibiting public meetings by holding such meetings, provided they were certain that there was no possibility of violence.

Before the Conference proceeded to the disobedience resolutions the mother of the Ali Brothers made a short appeal for the Angora Fund as a result of which money to the extent of several thousands was collected on the spot.

Maulvi Abdul Majid Badayun moved the resolution which declared that, in spite of all their strenuous efforts the British Government had denied justice to the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and had, on the other hand, started a full-fledged repression by imprisoning the leaders and by declaring unlawful the peaceful associations of citizens in order to stifle legitimate and peaceful agitation; the Conference, therefore, called upon all Muslims of and above the age of 18 to join the Volunteer Corps regardless of imprisonment and death.

The Conference also desired that civil disobedience, by way of holding public meetings where they were prohibited, be entered upon, provided the

Provincial Congress Committee were satisfied that there was no fear of violence.

Stirring speeches were made in support of this resolution by Messrs. Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, Abdur Rahman, Madan Singh, Chowdhuri Rambhujdutt and Srimati Gangadevi of Farrukhabad and Srimati Jamnabai. Of these the first two speakers confessed that before the present repression was started the Non-co-operators found themselves at their wit's end to find out such an occasion and such a ground upon which civil disobedience could be started throughout the length and breadth of this country, but they were thankful to Lord Reading's administration which through its blunders had offered a splendid and much sought for opportunity to fight their battle to the finish with lightening speed. At the same time, the day on which the Government of India decided on declaring the volunteers' associations unlawful, they digged the grave of their own administration.

The resolution, was passed with acclamation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO KEMALISTS

Another resolution congratulating the Kemalists on their successes was also adopted without discussion.

THE INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION

Before the Conference adjourned at eleven in the night till the next day the President, Hakim Ajmal Khan, announced that the subjects Committee of the Conference had, on the motion of Mr. Azad Sobhani, supported by Mr. Hasrat Mohani, by a majority resolved to ask all Mahommedans and other communities to endeavour to destroy British imperialism and secure complete independence.

This resolution stated that whereas through the persistent policy and attitude of the British Government it cannot be expected that British imperialism would permit the Jazirat-ul-Arab and the Islamic world to be completely free from the influence and control of non-Muslims, which means that the Khilafat cannot be secured to the extent that the Shariat demands its safety, therefore, in order to secure permanent safety of the Khilafat and the prosperity of India, it is necessary to endeavour to destroy British Imperialism. This Conference holds the view that the only way to make this effort is, for the Muslims, conjointly with other inhabitants of India, to make India completely free, and that this Conference is of opinion that Muslim opinion about Swaraj is the same, that is, complete independence, and it expects that other inhabitants of India would also hold the same point of view.

On the Conference resuming its sitting on the second day, 27 December 1921, a split was found to have taken place in the camp over this resolution about independence. When Mr. Hasrat Mohani was going to move his resolution declaring as their goal, independence and the destruction of British Imperialism, objection was taken to its consideration by a member of the Khilafat

Subjects Committee on the ground that according to their constitution no motion which contemplated a change in their creed could be taken as adopted, unless it was voted for in the Subjects Committee by a majority of two-thirds.

The President, Hakim Ajmal Khan, upheld this objection and ruled the independence motion out of order.

Mr. Hasrat Mohani strongly protested and pointed out that the President had disallowed a similar objection by the same member in the Subjects Committee, while he had allowed it in the open Conference. He said that the President had maneuvered to rule his motion out of order to stand in their way of declaring from that Conference that their Swaraj meant complete independence.

The Conference then passed resolutions appealing for the Angora Fund, condemning Government atrocities in Malabar, sympathising with the Moplahs in their suffering, and congratulating them on their sacrifices in the cause of religion, and condemning those Moplahs who were resopnsible for forcible conversion of Hindus.

After the Conference was over Mr. Hasrat Mohani appealed to the delegates to stay and pass his resolution. About half the number of delegates remained inside the pandal, and on being asked declared that they agreed to complete independence.

Source: The Indian Annual Register, 1922.

47

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS OF MAULANA HASRAT MOHANI AT THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE MUSLIM LEAGUE

Ahmedabad, 30 December 1921

The fourteenth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League opened at Ahmedabad on 30 December 1921 under the Presidency of Maulâna Hasrat Mohani under a specially erected pandal. The attendance was large. Among those present were Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Vijairaghavachariar, Mr. Patel, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Hon. Mr. Raja Ali, Dr. Ansari and others. Mr. Abbas Tayabji, Chairman of the Reception Committee, in welcoming the delegates traced the history of the Muslim League and concluded that after the great help of the Hindus on the Khilafat question and after finding that the League and the Congress had the same objects in view, he thought that the

League should cease to be a separate and distinct body and that it should merge itself into the Congress.

The President, Maulana Hasrat Mohani then delivered his address. It was from beginning to end a plea for declaration, on 1 January 1922, of an Indian Republic called the United States of India. He said :

Gentlemen, while thanking you for electing me to preside over this session of the All-India Muslim League I wish to say in all sincerity that the importance of this session of the League in which the fate of Hindustan is to be decided required the choice of a person abler than myself, such as Maulana Mohammed Ali, Dr. Kitchlew or Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, to preside over its deliberations. But unfortunately the Government has forcibly taken away the first two gentlemen from amongst us while Maulana Azad* expressed his inability to accept the responsibility. Consequently, as the proverb goes, 'If you do not accept it willingly it will be forced on thee,' this great duty was placed on my shoulders. I will try to discharge it to the best of my ability, but success is in the hands of God.

The present condition of the League appears to be very weak indeed; but this does not in the least derogate from its real importance, for, it was the All-India Muslim League which actually realised the first and the most essential condition of Indian independence, the Hindu-Muslim unity. And now that it has been achieved it is for the League to maintain it also. Besides, it is on the platform of the League that all sections of political opinion amongst the Mussulmans, extremists or moderates, have so far been and in future will probably be brought together.

Before going into the causes of the weakness of the League it will be better to enumerate its aims and objects. These are : (1) The attainment of Swaraj by the people of India by all peaceful and legitimate means; (2) to protect and advance the political, religious and other rights and interest of the Indian Mussulmans; (3) to promote friendship and union between the Mussulmans and other communities of India; (4) to maintain and strengthen the brotherly relations between the Mussulmans of India and those of other countries.

INDIA'S IDEAL

The first of these is also known to be the creed of the 'Congress'. Therefore, so long as the word Swaraj is not defined in consonance with the Muslim desire and the means for its attainment are not amplified, it is only natural that the Muslim interests in the League should be meagre. The third object, which is Hindu-Muslim unity, is the common object both of the League and the Congress. The fourth object, the unity of the Muslim world, which, along with other questions connected with the Khilafat, has specially taken up by the Khilafat Committee. There remains only the second object, that is, the

* Maulana Azad has since been arrested and sentenced to one year rigorou imprisonment under Sec. 124A I.P.C.

protection of the special interest of the Mussulmans. As to this, so long as a much greater and more important object, that is the attainment of Swaraj, still remains unachieved, people should better direct their united efforts against the common enemy than look after their special interests. They will be attended to when time comes for it.

As if these causes were not sufficient in themselves to decrease the Muslim influence in the League, its rules and regulations were unfortunately so framed that while public opinion has developed at a rapid pace, most members of the League have not moved an inch from their first position. As a result, the League remains nothing more than an old calendar. It is very necessary to remove the causes of the weakness of the League and to remove them immediately; for, in proportion as we approach nearer and nearer to the goal of Swaraj the need of the League will be more, because the questions of special Muslim rights will rise again with greater importance when India is free. Our first duty, therefore, should be to reduce the fee for the membership of the League and thus increase its members who will choose their representatives on the League every year. The members of the Council of the Provincial and the All-India Muslim League should be chosen, as is the case with the Congress, every year.

PLEA FOR A CHANGE

But the most pressing necessity of all is a change in the first object of the League to suit the changed Muslim condition. Every one of us knows that the word Swaraj has been definitely left vague and undefined. The creed of the Congress, the object of it, has been that if the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs are settled on the lines of our demands then Swaraj within the British Empire will be considered sufficient. Otherwise, efforts will be directed towards the attainment of complete independence. But gentlemen, from the Muslim point of view, it is not enough that we should stand for complete independence alone. It is necessary to decide upon the form that it should take, and in my opinion it can only be an Indian Republic on the lines of the United States of America. Besides this, the term 'peaceful' which defines and restricts the scope of the legitimate means for the attainment of Swaraj in the Congress creed is opposed to the natural and religious aspirations of the Mussulmans; therefore in the creed of the League the words 'possible' and 'proper' should be substituted for the words 'legitimate' and 'peaceful'. I will explain the matter in detail. The Mussulmans should understand it clearly that they will derive a two-fold advantage from the establishment of an Indian Republic. Firstly, the general benefit which they will undoubtedly share along with their Indian brethren as citizens of a common state; secondly, the special advantage which the Mussulmans will derive from it is that with every decline in the prestige and power of the British Empire which today is the worst enemy of the Muslim countries, the Muslim world will get breathing time and opportunity to improve its condition

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

Gentlemen, in spite of the present Hindu-Muslim unity there still exists many serious misunderstandings and suspicion between these two great communities of Hindustan, and it is of primary importance that we should grasp the true nature of these misunderstandings. The Hindus have a lurking suspicion that given an opportunity of Mahommedan invasion of India the Mussulmans will at least help their co-religionists in case they invaded to plunder and devastate Hindustan; and these misunderstandings are so deep-rooted, and widespread that so far as my knowledge goes no Indian statesman has escaped it except the late Lokmanya Tilak. On the other hand, the Mussulmans suspect that on the achievement of self-government the Hindus will acquire greater political powers and will use their numerical superiority to crush the Mussulmans. Gentlemen, it is quite clear that those misunderstandings can only be won over by compromise, discussion and mutual understanding that the third party should not come between them. The generality of Mussulmans with a few exceptions are afraid of the numerical superiority of the Hindus and are absolutely opposed to an ordinary Reform Scheme as a substitute for complete independence. The primary reason for this is that in a merely reformed, as contrasted with an independent Government, they will be under a double suspicion. First, a subjection to the Government of India which will be common to Hindus and Mussulmans; secondly, a subjection to the Hindu majority which they will have to face in every department of the Government. On the other hand, if the danger of the English power is removed the Mussulmans will only have the Hindu majority to fear and fortunately this fear is such as will be automatically removed with the establishment of the Indian Republic for, while the Mussulmans as a whole are in minority in India yet nature has provided a compensation; the Mussulmans are not in a minority in all the provinces. In some provinces such as Kashmir, Punjab, Sind, Bengal and Assam the Mussulmans are more numerous than the Hindus. In the United States of India the Hindu majority in Madras, Bombay, and the United Provinces will not be allowed to overstep the limits of moderation against the Mussulmans. Similarly, so long as a completely liberated India does not come in the hands of the Hindus and Mussulmans themselves, the Hindus will be always suspicious that in case of a foreign invasion the Mussulmans will aid their co-religionist invaders. But, on the establishment of Indian Republic which will be shared in common, Mussulmans will not desire that the power of even a Muslim foreigner should be established over his country. Gentlemen, I have just stated it as a necessary condition of the Hindu-Muslim compromise and that the third party, the English, should not be allowed to step in between us. Otherwise all our affairs will fall into disorder.

THE MOPLAH INCIDENT

Its best example is before you in the shape of the Moplah incident. You

are probably aware that Hindu India has an open and direct complaint against the Moplahs and an indirect complaint against all of us that the Moplahs are plundering and spoiling their innocent Hindu neighbours. But probably you are not aware that the Moplahs justify their action on the ground, that at such a critical juncture, when they are engaged in a war against the English, their neighbours not only do not help them and observe neutrality but aid and assist the English in every possible way. They can no doubt contend that while they are fighting a defensive war for the sake of their religion and have left their houses, property and belongings and taken refuge in hills and jungles, it is unfair to characterise as plunder their commandeering of the money, provision and other necessities for their troops, from the English and their supporters. Gentlemen, both are right in their complaint, but so far as my investigation goes the cause of this mutual recrimination can be traced to the interference of the third party. It happens thus; whenever any English detachement suddenly appear in their locality and kill the Moplah inhabitants of the place, rumour somehow spreads in the neighbourhood that the Hindu inhabitants of the place had invited the English army for their protection. With the result that after the departure of the English troops Moplahs or their neighbours do not hesitate to retaliate and consider the money and other belongings of the Hindus as lawful spoils of war taken from those who have aided and abetted the enemy. Where no such events have occurred the Moplahs and the Hindus even now live side by side; the Moplahs do not commit any excesses against the Hindus, while the Hindus do not hesitate in helping the Moplahs to the best of their ability.

THE TWO MEANS TO WIN I

I have wandered from purpose. I meant to emphasise that in the first clause dealing with the aims and objects of the League the word Swaraj should be defined as complete independence in the cause of an Indian Republic. Otherwise, there is a danger that in the presence of a third party self-government within the British instead of being beneficial might actually prove injurious. The second amendment necessary is that the methods for the attainment of Swaraj should be amplified. In place of only 'peaceful and legitimate means,' 'possible and proper' ones should be substituted. Thus, on the one hand, opportunity of joining the League will be given to thòse who do not honestly believe in non-cooperation alone as the sole path of salvation and recognising the possibility of other methods to adopt them. Also, on the other hand, the amendment will remove the complaint of those who believe that non-cooperation can, under no circumstances, remain peaceful to the last; and while subscribing to the creed of the Congress and the first clause of the section dealing with the object of the League as a matter of policy and expediency refuse to admit it as a faith for all times and circumstances or to remain non-violent even in intention.

Gentlemen, there are two possible means of replacing one government by

another. One, the destruction of the government by sword and the establishment of another in its place—a method which has been followed in the world thus far. The second alternative is to sever all connection with the present government and to set up a better organised government parallel to it, and improve and develop it till the old order is dissolved and the new takes its place. Friends—to achieve this objects we must immediately set up on a separate and permanent foundation of our own courts, schools, arts, industries, army, police and a national Parliament. Non-violent non-cooperation can only help to start the parallel government but cannot maintain it. The question now is, can such a parallel government be established through non-violent non-cooperation, of course, provided the rival government does not interfere with its establishment—a condition which is obviously impossible, because the rival government will certainly interfere. We might contend that we will proceed on with our work silently and quietly in spite of government interference as is being done at present.

WHEN NON-VIOLENCE WILL BE IMPOSSIBLE

A stage will however be reached ultimately when action on peaceful lines will absolutely become impossible, and then we will be forced to admit that a parallel government can be started but not continue to last through peaceful means. Examples of governmental repression are before your eyes. First, it attempted through the Karachi trials to prevent the Mussulmans from openly proclaiming the articles of their faith. When the people, undaunted by this decision of the government, preached throughout the length and breadth of India that it was unlawful to serve in the army, the government slowly overlooked these activities fearing lest mere repetition of the Karachi resolution might lead to disaffection in the army. And, in order to divert the attention of the people from these activities, it suddenly but deliberately declared enrolment of 'volunteers' as unlawful, so that it might get an opportunity of striking at the non-cooperation. Like moths that gather to sacrifice their lives round a lighted candle, the advocates of Civil Disobedience swarmed to break this declaration of Lord Reading and cheerfully went in their thousands to gaol. This is undoubtedly an example of self-sacrifice and self-effacement which well might move Mahatma Gandhi to ecstacy.

But we detect another truth hidden in this demonstration of happiness and joy. It reveals to our eyes the last stage of both the repression of government and patience of the people. People are no doubt prepared to bear and suffer gladly the hardship of a few days' imprisonment. But, on the declaration of Martial Law, non-violent non-cooperation movement will prove totally insufficient and useless. Amongst the Mussulmans at least, there will hardly be found a man who can have any but one of the two feelings in his heart when faced by the barrel of a gun, either to seek refuge in flight or to take advantage of the law of self-preservation and despatch his adversary to hell. The third alternative, that of cheerfully yielding up one's life to the

enemy and considering it to be one real success, will remain confined to Mahatma Gandhi and some of his adherents and fellow-thinkers. I, on my part, fear that in general the reply to Martial Law will be, what is commonly called, Guerilla Warfare, or in the words of the Quran 'kill them wherever you find them.' The responsibility for all this bloodshed will rest on the shoulders of the government.

Consequently, as representatives of the Mussulmans, the members of the All-Indian Muslims League should consider it their duty either to refrain from adopting non-cooperation as their creed or free it from the limitation of keeping it either violent or non-violent. For, it is not in our power to keep non-cooperation peaceful or otherwise. So long as government confines itself to the use of chains and fetters, non-cooperation can remain peaceful as it is to-day. But if things go further and government has recourse to gallows or machine guns, it will be impossible.

WHY MUSLIMS GO ONE STEP FURTHER

At this stage, people would like to ask how it is that while the Hindus are content to adopt non-violent non-cooperation as the means for attaining independence, the Mussulmans are anxious to go a step further. The answer is that the liberation of Hindustan is as much a political duty of Mussulman as that of a Hindu. Owing to the question of Khilafat it has become a Mussulman's religious duty also.

In this connection I should like to say just one word. The glories of Ghazi Mustapha Kemal Pasha and the conclusion of the recent France-Turkish treaty might credit an idea in some people's minds that the evacuation of Smyrna by the Greeks is a certainty and the restoration of Thrace to the Turks, if not certain, is within the bounds of possibility. Consequently, they might entertain the hope that the struggle in the near East is coming to a close. I want to warn all such people that the claims of the Mussulmans of India are founded more on religious than on political principles. So long as the Jazirat-ul-Arab (including Palestine and Mesopotamia) is not absolutely freed from non-Muslim influence and so long as the political and military power of the Khilafat-ul-Mussulmin is not fully restored, the Mussulmans of India cannot suspend their activities and efforts.

THE KHILAFAT DEMANDS

The Muslim demands as regards the Khilafat are these : (1) that in pursuance of the promise of Mr. Lloyd George, Thrace and Smyrna along with the city of Smyrna should remain purely under Turkish. control so that the political prestige of the Khilafat-ul-Mussulmin which is essential for the Khilafat should suffer no diminution. (2) All non-Turkish control should be removed from Constantinople, the shores of Marmora and the Dardanelles, in order that the Khilafat-al-Constantinople may not be under non-Muslim control which is essential for the Khilafat. (3) All naval and military restrictions

imposed on the Khilafat should be removed as otherwise he would have no power to enforce the orders of the Khilafat. (4) The Jazirat-ul-Arab, including Hedjaz, Palestine and Mesopotamia should be free from all Non-Muslim influence and not be under the British mandate as it was the death-bed injunction of the Prophet. It should be noted that in the fourth demand we wish the English to give up their mandate of Mesopotamia and Palestine and remove their influence from the Hedjaz. As to the question, whether the Arabs will acknowledge the Sheriff of Mecca or the Sultan of Turkey as their Khalifa or whether the Arab Government of Hedjaz, Mesopotamia and Palestine will be independent or under the suzerainty of the Khalifa, they will be decided by the Mussulmans. We do not want non-Muslim advice or assistance.

LEAGUE-CONGRESS COMPACT

In my opinion, gentlemen, the most pressing necessity of Hindustan is the immediate conclusion of a definite compact between the Congress and the League. The Congress should not enter into any negotiations with the government concerning Swaraj (1) until the minimum Muslim demands with regard to the Khilafat are satisfied, (2) on the other hand, the Muslims should definitely bind themselves that even when their demands with regard to the Khilafat are satisfied, the Mussulmans of India will stand to the last by the side of their Hindu brethren for the attainment and reservation of Indian independence.

Such a compact is all the more necessary because there are signs that the enemies of Indian independence and we have to confess with regret that a number of deceitful Indians are working with the foreigners—are concentrating all their efforts to wreck the Hindu-Muslim unity and create distrust and misunderstanding between the communities. On the one hand, the Mussulmans are being enticed by false hopes with regard to Khilafat question. On the other, some showy toys of political concessions are being prepared as a gift for the Hindus even before the stipulated period of ten years. It is intended that in their simplicity the Mussulmans should consider the return of Smyrna etc., as the satisfaction of their Khilafat demands and slacken their efforts for the attainment of Swaraj, while the Hindus should be misled into believing a further instalment of reforms as the Swaraj itself or at least its precursor and begin to consider the Khilafat as an irrelevant question.

There can be only one solution for all these problems. Hindus and Mussulmans, after mutual consultation, should have Indian Independence declared by Mahatma Gandhi, so that in future neither the English might have an opportunity of deceiving nor India of being deceived. After the declaration of independence the Congress and the League will have only one object left, that is, the preservation of Swaraj. 1922 is the best date for the purpose, because we would thus have fulfilled the promise that we made to attain Swaraj within this year, and the people of India will have achieved success in the eyes of God and man (Cheers).

MUSLIM LEAGUE : SECOND DAY SESSION

31 December 1921

The Muslim League met at 9 p.m. on 31 December 1921. After it had passed some non-contentious resolutions the President Hasrat Mohani made an announcement amidst applause that the proposed decision of the Subjects Committee rejecting his resolution regarding the attainment of independence and destruction of British Imperialism would be held as final and representing the opinion of the majority in the League, but that in view of the great importance of the subject he would allow a discussion on that resolution without taking any vote.

Mr. Azad Sobhani who had moved the resolution in the Subjects Committee, also moved it in the League. He said he believed in Hindu-Muslim unity as absolutely essential in non-violent non-cooperation as the only way to fight their battle and Mahatma Gandhi was fully deserving the dictatorship which had been invested in him by the Congress, but that he also believed that British imperialism was the greatest danger to Indian and the Moslem world and must be destroyed by placing before them an ideal of independence.

Mr. Azad Sobhani was followed by several speakers who supported him in the same vein.

The Hon'ble Mr. Raza Ali announced that the reason for the ruling of the President was that the League did not want to take a step which the Congress had not taken. He warned them against saying big things without understanding them and reminded the audience that India was at present ready for maintaining liberty even if it was attained.

He asked, who would, for instance, be their Commander-in-Chief if the British left to-morrow. (A voice, 'Enver Pasha').

The speaker emphatically declared that he would not tolerate any foreigner. He wanted an Indian Commander-in-Chief.

Among the other resolutions passed by the League was one about the Moplahs, which condemned the Government's excesses and the reported conversion by Moplahs.

The President then closed the Session after a short speech.

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1922.**

48

LETTER FROM THE VICEROY TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA

9 February 1922

The following is a general appreciation of the situation as regards non-co-operation. In order to explain the situation as it exists, it is necessary to trace the origin of the non-cooperation movement and its developments. It is impossible to give within the scope of a telegram an adequate appreciation of the whole situation, and the Government of India would have preferred, had time permitted, to send a considered despatch. As, however, the matter is one of great urgency we have done our best to give a connected account in the message that follows.

The first manifestation of non-cooperation with government as a political force took place about the beginning of 1920. The spirit of nationalism in this country as elsewhere had been greatly stimulated and intensified by the war and the pronouncements made as to the principles for which the Allies stood. It was intended by the Reforms Act of 1919 to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Indian people, and moderate and reasonable opinion was to a certain extent satisfied thereby. An extreme section of Indian politicians rejected it as inadequate, but opposition to it might not have assumed formidable proportions had it not been for the operation of social causes, in particular, racial feeling which had been engendered by the Punjab disturbances in 1919, the economic distress which resulted from the general rise in prices, the bitter resentment on the part of Mahommedans over the delay in announcing the terms of peace with Turkey and their apprehensions lest these terms should prove unfavourable to Turkey. It was a result of these causes that the doctrine of non-cooperation which was a revival of Gandhiji's Satyagrah a movement of 1919, began to make rapid progress in 1920.

In March 1920 Gandhiji established close relations with Mahommed Ali, Shaukat Ali, and other leaders of the Khilafat movement, and he announced publicly that the movement had his sympathy and that he would lead the non-cooperation movement, directed against the Government, if the terms of peace with Turkey did not meet the sentiments of his Moslem fellow subjects. He declared in this manifesto that the only remedy left open to him was non-cooperation based on non-violence. There was no very clear announcement at that time of the precise form which the movement would take, but Gandhiji defined his programme later in the year after the Turkish peace terms had been published. There was to be a beginning of non-cooperation by :

(1) the resignation of titles and honorary posts;

(2) the resignation of posts in the Civil Services of Government, the

police being excluded :

(3) the resignation of service in the police and the army;

(4) the refusal to pay taxes.

By resolutions passed at a special meeting of Congress held at Calcutta in September 1920 the following items were added to the programme.

(1) withdrawal of children from educational institutions aided and controlled by Government and establishment in their places of National Schools and Colleges;

(2) boycott by lawyers and litigants of British Courts and establishment of private Arbitration Courts;

(3) refusal by military, clerical and labouring classes to volunteer for service in Mesopotamia;

(4) withdrawal of candidates for election on new Councils and abstention on the part of voters;

(5) gradual boycott of foreign goods.

All the foregoing steps were to be initiated before resignation of service in police and army and refusal to pay taxes, both of which were to be started only at the final stages of the campaign.

Little enthusiasm was roused at first by the movement; all sections of moderate opinion were opposed to it, and even by Tilak and his followers it was regarded with some doubt and suspicion, while Hindus opinion naturally was averse from a close alliance with the more violent and fanatical aspects of the Khilafat movement. But the personality of the leader of the non-co-operation movement who was believed to be a selfless ascetic, a character which has a peculiar attraction for Indians, the propaganda which he and his lieutenants assiduously carried on, the intense irritation which had been caused among Mahommedans by announcement of the Turkish peace terms, and in particular of the increasing economic pressure on large section of the population, drew a growing number of adherents gradually to the movement.

2. Certain disquieting symptoms commenced to show themselves in the movement towards the end of the year 1920. A tendency to imitate military methods was developed in some of the volunteers associations, which had been originally started, at any rate nominally, for philanthropic and social service, and the leaders of the agitation against government were not slow to utilise for political purposes these organisations as a potent instrument of social boycott.

Thus volunteer movement has presented peculiar difficulties, partly owing to the fact that some of the associations were in the past founded in good faith, in pursuance of some form of social service and have, in fact, on occasions rendered valuable assistance in assisting strangers and facilitating the maintenance of order at great religious fairs and pilgrimages ,and partly owing to our disinclination to interfere with Associations whose activities were ostensibly directed to political objects which did not come within the criminal law. Violence is opposed to the professed objects for which members

are drawn into these bodies; yet gradually the establishment of these Associations has put into the hands of the leaders powerful organisations, which can be, and have been, used for sinister purposes. Attempts to usurp functions of police, intimidation and use of violence to enforce hartals and social and commercial boycott, or under guise of 'swadeshi' or temperance movements in order to impair authority of Government and terrorise political opponents, have been prominent features of their recent activities. In some places they have military drill and exercises been practised. The avoidance of violence has throughout been a part of their ostensible creed, and it was a matter of no small difficulty to decide at what point their suppression was essential in the interest of law and order, and would not be condemned by public opinion as undue interference with freedom of political association. The non-cooperation movement presented other sinister features in the growing violence of speeches made by the principal Khilafat leaders, and it endeavoured to enlist the sympathy of students and immature school-boys while cause for anxiety was given by the possible effects on the Indian army and police of a campaign of seditious propaganda. As early as April 1920 instructions were issued by Lord Chelmsford's Government that there should be prompt prosecution of all persons tampering with the loyalty of the troops or the police and a scheme for instituting counter-propaganda was formulated in July of the same year. In September instructions were issued to local governments to take action vigorously to prosecute for all incitements to violence and their attention was drawn in October to the dangerous potentialities which lay in the volunteer movement. Lastly, in November 1920 a resolution was passed by Lord Chelmsford's government defining their general attitude towards the non-cooperation campaign. It was explained that although the entire movement was unconstitutional they had refrained from instituting criminal proceedings against such of its promoters as had advocated simultaneously with non-cooperation abstention from violence, and they had given instructions to local governments that action should be taken against those persons only who, in order to further the movement, had advanced beyond the limits which its organizers had originally set up and had openly incited the public to violence by speech or writing, or endeavoured to tamper with the loyalty of the army or the ,Police. The following considerations had influenced government in adopting this policy :

(1) Reluctance to interfere with the freedom of the Press and liberty of speech at a time when India was on the threshold of a great advance towards self-government.

(2) The knowledge that those against whom prosecution might be directed would be likely to find in it the opportunity of posing as martyrs, and that they might swell the number of adherents to their cause by evoking false sympathy.

(3) The belief that non-cooperation would be rejected by the country as a whole as a visionary and chimerical scheme, the result of which could only be

widespread disorder, political chaos and the ruin of all such as possessed a real stake in the country itself, the appeal being made to the ignorant and prejudiced and its creed being devoid of any constructive genius.

(4) At the Congress meeting which was held in December 1920 at Nagpur a new stage was reached. Little up to that time in the way of solid achievement could be pointed to by the leaders of the movement. Although the movement had undoubtedly engendered in certain parts of the country a general spirit of disloyalty and lawlessness, little success had been attained in giving effect to the specific items of the non-cooperation programme; there had been very few surrender of titles, a handful only of lawyers and suspendend their practice, and, though in the elections to the Reformed Councils the voting had been somewhat interfered with, the constitution of these Councils had not been seriously affected by it. Strong opposition had been provoked by the attack on educational institutions and the attack had no lasting effect. But Gandhiji at Nagpur was successful in capturing the entire Congress organisation for his party. Indication of the growing strength in that body of the extremist element was given by the change in the first article of the Constitution of the Congress which was affected by an overwhelming majority, the object of Congress being defined now as the attainment of Swaraj by all legitimate and peaceful means. There was an omission of the reference to British connection. It became, moreover, clear by this time that the intention of the leader of the movement was to spare no efforts by which the mere ignorant masses might be permeated with their doctrine. An increasing activity with this object in view marked the early spring of 1921. There was great astuteness shown in promoting labour unrest and exploiting economic grievances, and promises of the wildest character were freely made (as now) to ignorant peasants—for example, rent-free lands, cheap clothes, cheap food and free railway passes. The first evidence of this policy was the widespread agitation among the tenantry of Oudh, from which in January 1921 serious disturbances resulted, and there was exploitation with some success about the same time by the non-cooperation leaders of the Akali movement among the Sikhs—a movement which in its inception seems to have been inspired by a genuine desire for religious reform—and success was attained to some extent by such leaders in giving to the movement a character which was definitely anti-government. At the end of January the local governments received from Lord Chelmsford's Government fresh instructions in view of these developments. That Government, while they adhered to the general policy which had been enunciated in November 1920, impressed on the Local Governments the necessity for instituting prosecutions with greater freedom in all cases of incitements to violence and endeavours to seduce police or Indian troops. Remedial legislation was urged where redress was demanded by genuine grievances. There were, too, to be steps taken for starting counter propaganda whereby government's policy would be justified, and, in general, for enforcing respect for the law Government at the same time took every opportunity during

the first session of the Reformed Legislature of convincing Indian opinion that the Reforms were real and great and that they had conferred on the representatives of the people wide powers and that there was a readiness to inquire into the cause of discontent or any specific grievances. It was, for example, agreed to refer to non-official Committtees of the Legislature certain Acts which conferred extraordinary powers on the Executive, as well as the Acts regulating the conduct of the Press; the greatest consideration was shown in framing the Budget to the opinion of the Legislature.

As the result of the agitation which was carried on by the non-cooperation leaders, there took place in the early summer of 1920 a stampede from the Tea Gardens of Assam of coolies to the number of many thousands, and there was simultaneously a strike on the Assam-Bengal Railway. Another development was a strong campaign against the use of foreign cloth and the drink traffic, an operation in which a prominent part was played by intimidation. In spite of numerous prosecutions and restrictive orders a general weakening of the respect for law and order resulted from all these activities; frequent out-breaks of mob violence followed from this in various parts of the country and racial feeling directed against Europeans increased, whether they were engaged in comm rce or in the service of Government. The leaders of the Khilafat party simultaneously employed language, which steadily increased in violence and many sections of the Mahommedan community, which had hitherto been untouched by it, were permeated by the agitation which aimed at the restoration of the Sultan of Turkey to his temporal power and pre-war religious ascendency. A series of speeches were made by the Ali brothers in the winter and the spring at various towns, in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, and in these speeches Great Britain was openly described as the arch enemy of Islam, and they did all in their power to incite against the British the animosity of their coreligionists. They declared that a time would arrive, and it would be incumbent on all Mussulmans as a religious duty, to draw the sword in defence of their religion; nor did they hestitate to put forward the view that if a Mahommedan Power were to invade India with the object of avenging the cause of Islam they would support it. While their prosecution for these speeches was under consideration, their friends induced them to sign a public apology and to undertake that in future they would refrain from speeches and writings which incited to violence or tended to the creation of an atmosphere of preparedness for violence. In a latter addressed in June 1921 to all local governments the situation was reviewed. The government of India were still convinced, in spite of the disquieting symptoms to which reference has been made above, of the soundness of the general policy which had been pursued hitherto. They indicated at the same time that the attitude of government should in no way be relaxed towards any advocacy of violence, including not only direct incitements but speeches calculated to give rise to feelings of disaffection, enmity or hatred such as were likely to lead to

violence not as a remote or ultimate consequence but as a probable result in the near future.

(5) A little time after this a more open form was assumed by the attempts to create disaffection in the ranks of the police and the army. There was widely published about midsummer on the alleged authority of 501 Ulemas (learned men) a Fatwa, that is, religious pronouncement, which purported to interpret the precepts of the Koran. All service under Government was declared in this to be forbidden by the Mussulman religion, and service in the police and the army was stigmatised as a specially heinous sin. A resolution was passed at Karachi in July at the meeting of the All-India Khilafat Committee, Mohammed Ali presiding, to the effect that it was incumbent on all Mahommedans as a religious duty not to join the Indian Army or to continue to serve in it or to give assistance in recruiting for the army, and that the duty of all Mahommedans was to bring to the notice of the Moslem soldiers this religious injunction. Mahommed Ali, with Shaukat Ali his brother, and 4 other Khilafat leaders, were afterwards prosecuted for this resolution and convicted, the conviction being under the ordinary law. In the month of July riots or minor disturbances took place, with serious loss of life in some instances, at the following places : Dharwar, Madras, Aligarh, Calcutta, Chittagong, Matiari, Karachi. A fuller account of these events will be found in the Repressive Law Committee Report of the Indian Legislature together with its appendices. In the month of August took place the outbreak of the Moplahs. This was an organised rebellion of a whole countryside which was populated by Moslem tribes of a peculiary backward and ignorant character, whose fanaticism the Khilafat leaders had by their speeches and writings deliberately excited. Without doubt a considerable body of Hindu opinion was alienated from the Khilafat movement by this rebellion, in which many thousands of Hindus were plundered and many hundreds murdered, as it has become widely known that many Hindus were forcibly converted to Islam and Hindu temples desecrated. Attempts have been made to exploit to the discredit of the government the lamentable railway train episode in which Moplah prisoners lost their life, but these have had little effect on Hindu opinion. Events in Malabar, however, brought about no modification in the attitude of Mahatma Gandhi. At Delhi on 4 November every Province was authorised by the Congress Committee to start civil disobedience. This authorisation stipulated, however, that conditions, such as proficiency in the spinning wheel, should be fulfilled, the nature of which was so impracticable as to indicate that the immediate inception of this policy was not desired by the Congress. On the day of the landing in India of the Prince of Wales, viz., 17 November a general hartal (cessation of business) took place in Northern India in most of the principal towns. An enthusiastic welcome was received by the Prince in Bombay itself, but an attack by non-cooperation on people returning from His Royal Highness's arrival developed into serious riots which lasted three days; in these several Europeans were murdered, and in all there was a casualty list of 53 killed and

approximately 400 wounded. Widespread intimidation on the part of the volunteers marked the hartal in Calcutta; on a smaller scale the same thing occured in other large towns.

(6) A new and dangerous situation confronted Government after the events of 17 November. An increasing disregard for lawful authority and the growth of a dangerous spirit of lawlessness had been engendered by the outbreaks of the last few months, and it had become evident that a systematic campaign of violence, intimidation and obstruction had been embarked on by many of the volunteer associations, to combat which it had proved ineffective to proceed under the ordinary criminal law. In many places these associations were at first recruited from educated classes, but as the campaign became more violent they began to draw adherents from unemployed labours, mill hands and city rabble, many of whom were paid on their service. Government decided in these circumstances that measures of a more comprehensive and drastic character should be resorted to, and information was sent to the local government that sanction could be given to the application of the Seditious Meetings Act in any district where it was considered necessary to adopt that course. Instructions were also given to them that vigorous use should be made of the provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Act Part II, for combating the volunteer associations' illegal activities, and that troops should be employed more freely, both in order to reinforce the police and to hearten and encourage all law-abiding citizens, and the measures to be taken in the event to civil disobedience being inaugurated were laid down. Provincial Governments were assured of the full support of the Government of India in checking disorder, while the formation of armed police battalions and the extensive enrolment of special constables was suggested. In particular, they were informed that they should not hesitate to prosecute any offenders against the ordinary law, however prominent their position, whose arrest and prosecution was, in their opinion, required for the maintenance of authority. Emphasis was laid on the importance of counteracting decisively the first active measures taken to give effect to civil disobedience. It was made clear that the full strength of Government's resources was to be employed, if necessary, for this purpose, and that the most prominent participators in the movement, not excluding Gandhiji, should be arrested immediately and prosecuted. Action was promptly taken by practically all local governments in Northern India, in accordance with these instructions. The Seditious Meetings Act was introduced in most of the seriously affected districts in the Punjab, Bihar, Bengal, Assam and Burma. In some Provinces the various Associations had been proclaimed as unlawful under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, a few days before the receipt of our instructions, and certain other Provinces have now issued similar proclamations. A large number of persons have also been arrested and convicted under that Act and other enactments for preservation of law and order. At the same time prosecutions were more freely instituted against newspapers, leaders and speakers who had incited to violence.

Throughout the year proceedings had been taken against a number of persons who had directly or indirectly advocated violence. Although serious alarm had been caused among a substantial section of Moderate opinion by the turn events that had taken in the middle of November, and it had demanded that sterner measures should be adopted by the Government, a disappointing revulsion of Moderate opinion in political and journalistic circles followed on the enforcement of the two Acts to which reference has been made above and the prosecution and conviction under them of a large number of persons.

An inclination was shown to represent the new policy as an interference with the freedom of association for political purposes and with the right of free speech, and there was a disposition on this ground to make common cause with the Extremists. It was urged by many of the leaders of Moderate opinion that a Round Table Conference should be held at which Government should be represented and all shades of political opinion, in order that some solution might be found of the situation through the means of some act of constructive statesmanship; there was advanced however no definite constructive suggestion. A deputation to His Excellency the Viceroy on the 21st December in Calcutta advanced the demand for a Conference. The speech of His Excellency explained to the deputation fully the reasons by which Government were induced to enforce special Acts. It emphasised the determination of Government to protect its law-abiding subjects, and a grave warning was in it conveyed as to the effect which affronts offered to the Throne were likely to produce on the public and on Parliament in the United Kingdom. Insistence was also made by His Excellency on the imperative necessity of the discontinuance of the unlawful activities of the non-cooperation party as a fundamental condition which should precede the discussion of any question of a Conference. A steadying effect was brought about in Moderate opinion by his speech. During Christmas week the Congress held its annual meeting at Ahmedabad. Gandhiji had been deeply impressed by the rioting at Bombay, as statements made by him at the time had indicated, and the rioting had brought home to him the dangers of mass civil disobedience; and the resolutions of the Congress gave evidence of this, since they not only rejected the proposals which the extreme wing of the Khilafat party had advanced for abandoning the policy of non-violence, but whilst organisation of civil disobedience when fulfilment of the Delhi conditions had taken place was urged in them, omitted any reference to the non-payment of taxes and were worded in such a way as to suggest that for the present civil disobedience would be restricted to defiance of the Seditious Meetings Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act directed against unlawful associations. Gandhiji was appointed to be the sole executive authority of the Congress Committee. An overwhelming majority in the Subjects Committee of the Congress, rejected the resolution as to a Round Table Conference, and it was made clear by Gandhiji that any such Conference, must be Conference which would meet to register his decrees. In January there was held at Bombay a Conference of politicians outside the Congress

fold in order to formulate terms upon which it would be possible to have a Conference. The resolutions which purported to have been passed by this body were passed in reality by 20 only out of 200 persons. According to our information the attitude of Gandhiji, who attended it and announced that he reserved the right to continue, during a conference preparations for civil disobedience and the enrolment of volunteers, in return for the impossible conditions which Government were asked to accept, had the result that Sir Sankaran Nair, the President, withdrew and that Moderate opinion was alienated and disgusted.

Communication of the resolutions was subsequently made to His Excellency the Viceroy who in reply stated that the basis for any profitable discussion as to a Conference was not contained in them. The presentation of what was practically an ultimatum to the Viceroy by Mahatma Gandhi followed on 4 February. He declared in this document that the non-cooperation party had a campaign of civil disobedience forced upon them, in order that they might secure the elementary rights of free speech, free association and free Press, which he maintained that Government had sought by its recent measures to repress, and he charged the Viceroy with having rejected summarily the proposal for a Conference although the terms which had been accepted by the Working Committee of Congress accorded with the requirement of His Excellency as his Calcutta speech had indicated them. An announcement was at the same time made by him that if Government agreed to release all prisoners convicted and under-trial for non-violent activities on the part of the non-cooperation party, he would be prepared to postpone civil disobedience of an aggressive character, till the offenders now in prison had an opportunity of reviewing the whole situation, while continuing the illegal and seditious propaganda of the non-cooperation party. It was in reply to this manifesto that the Government of India issued the communique already published.

(7) The following may be said to be the situation at the moment : The lower classes in the towns have been seriously affected, although in the various items of its programme which have hitherto been attempted it has failed or secured but a partial success; and although the influence of the movement has been much smaller in the rural tracts generally, in certain areas the peasantry have been affected particularly in parts of the Assam Valley, United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa and Bengal. As regards the Punjab, the Akali agitation which the Extremists had fostered for their own ends has penetrated to the rural Sikhs. A large population of the Mahommedan population throughout the country are embittered and sullen as a result of the Khilafat agitation, the need for counteracting which through a modification of the Sevres Treaty has been incessantly and emphatically urged by the Government of India. We desire to take this opportunity of reiterating our convictions as to the imperative necessity of conciliating Mahommedan opinion by the modification of Turkish peace terms. We believe that in the appeasement of 70 million

Mahommedans of India and consequent relief to a situation of real danger, tranquility of India is of the utmost importance. Moderate opinion, on the other hand, has been alarmed and alienated by the recent declarations, the attitude of Gandhiji and his failure so far to achieve any definite result has compelled him to resort to civil disobedience, which he proposes to start in Berdoli Taluka where he has a strong local following and to join issue on grounds that will secure to the Government the maximum support for the measures it will take. While this entails grave possibilities, the Government of India are satisfied that the army and the great majority of the police are staunch. There is no disaffection on the part of the majority of the population, and there are now more promising economic conditions with a bumper harvest in prospect. Religious and racial feeling at the same time is so bitter that the government of India are prepared for disorder of a more formidable nature than has in the past occurred, and do not seek to minimise in any way the fact that great anxiety is caused by the situation.

(8) The Government of India desire in conclusion to make clear the principle which throughout has underlain their policy in regard to the non-cooperation movement. Of the risk inherent in this they have been fully conscious, and if the more drastic measures which have been demanded by some of their critics have not previously been adopted in dealing with it, this has not been owing to any distrust in their power to suppress any possible outbreaks nor because instructions from higher authority have tied their hands, but because their belief is that a statesmanlike policy must have in view the ultimate, more far reaching and more enduring consequences of any action taken rather than the immediate effects. It is with the co-operation of the people of India that British rule in India hitherto has been carried on, and it is essential for its continued success that there should be such co-operation. It has therefore been regarded by the Government of India as of the utmost consequence that they should carry with them, so far as practicable in any measure that they took against the non-cooperation movement, the approval and acquiescence of Indian opinion. Evidence is given by the recent debates in the Indian Legislature that in this they have been largely successful. Nevertheless, though the impracticable nature of the demands of non-cooperation is realised by sober and sensible Indians, it has not been possible to ignore the fact that the non-cooperation movement has to a large extent been engendered and sustained by nationalist aspirations, and, so far as Mahommedans are concerned, by religious feelings which have a strong appeal to those also who have not adopted its programme; and the Government of India have thought, bearing this in mind, that the path of wisdom lay in exercising, in regard to men swayed by such motives, as much forbearence as in their judgment was consistent with their responsibilities. It is their belief that this policy will be justified by its fruits in the long run.

Source : **The Indian Annual Register, 1922.**

49

KARACHI TRIAL

Mohammad Ali before addressing the Jury turning to the Court said : 'Can I have the Jury on this side ? I have not seen their faces yet. I want to seduce them like the troops.' (Laughter in Court).

The Court directed the Jurors to change their seats accordingly, and the Judge also changed the position of his seat turning left directly facing the accused.

Maulana Mohammad Ali then rose amid pindrop silence and addressing the Jury said :

Gentlemen of the Jury,! I just asked the Presiding Judge that he might permit me to see your faces, because with the exception of one of your number I had not hitherto been able to see your faces. And I also said that I want to seduce the Jury. Of course, there was behind that another intention, not the ultimate object perhaps, but incidental to it as the Public Prosecutor would say, I wanted you to act as a screen in front of the ladies now behind you, or the Public Prosecutor may add yet another charge of seduction against me (Laughter), but after all I find that as a result of my effort at seduction I have turned the Judge also towards me today (Laughter).

Gentlemen, I think I am going to take as much time as I can. So it is necessary to tell you beforehand that if I intended to defend myself or my friends and to escape from transportation for life or the jail, I don't know what the Judge has in store for me—it would have been absolutely unpardonable. No, gentlemen, for that purpose I would not have wasted a single moment of your time or of mine.

I do not want any defence, I have no defence to offer. And there is no need of defence, for it is not we who are on trial. It is the government itself that is on trial. It is the Judge himself who is on trial. It is the whole system of public prosecutions, the entire provisions of the law that are on trial. It is not a question of my defence. It is a very clear issue, and I thanked the government in the lower Court, because for the first time it came out into the open and gave us a chance of having a decision on a very clear-cut and pointed issue. That very clear-cut and pointed issue is this. Is God's law for a British subject to be more important or the King's law—a man's law ? Call him His Majesty or His Imperial Majesty—exalt him as much as you like—show all obedience to him, show him all the loyalty you can, pay him all the respect, entertain even superstitions about him if you like, but the question is—is this respect or are these superstitions going to stand even for the slightest moment in the way of loyalty which every human being owes to God ? Gentlemen, I think not for my own sake, nor for the sake of my co-accused, but I think for you. It is a misfortune that there is

not a single Muslim among you. Three of you are Christians, and two are Hindus. But that does not matter at all. I am speaking to human beings. I am speaking mostly to Indians. I do not know whether all of you are Indians, perhaps one of you is not, though he too may have his domicile in India and may have come to regard India, although an Englishman, as his home, and may therefore be regarded as an Indian. I am therefore speaking to a majority of you at least who come from a country which is imbued with the spirit of religion and which is traditionally a spiritual country and which has striven through the ages for the exaltation of the spirit as against the flesh.

Gentlemen, we hear so much of toleration in these enlightened days, and I do not think even the Public Prosecutor would contradict me if I say that we all want toleration. The British Government has never tired of saying that it is a tolerant government, and that British rule is firmly based on toleration. I do not think that the Government of any civilised country in this twentieth century could ever say that it is against toleration. But what is toleration after all ? It is this, as a well-known man said—'Sir, I disagree most heartily with every word of what you have said but, damn it, I shall fight to the last drop of my blood for your right to say it.' That is toleration. That is to say, toleration is [illegible] fc [illegible] sagreement, it is required where people hold very different view, where they have wide differences. Otherwise, there is no necessity for toleration. But the tolerant man tolerates all this and sacrifices everything for the maintenance of tolerance. Now, I might say, a man might hold very foolish opinions. I am sorry, many men do. I think the public prosecutor for one holds some very foolish opinions—and we have yet got to see what kind of opinion the Judge holds; that would be after I am silenced—but it is not the question whether a man's judgment is right or wrong—people's judgment may be foolish—the question is this, when any person or a body of persons gives you a pledge of freedom to hold your own opinions and act upto them, then I think it is their duty to abide by that pledge.

Now, gentlemen, what the case is against us we want the whole world to understand. After all, the result of the decision here will not be confined to the audience in the hall, or to the few scores of thousands of people in Karachi. It was said that the Resolution that was passed here was not meant for that small body of audience comprising a few Ulema and a few thousand people, but it was meant for a large audience. Now, this trial too is meant for more than the audience here in this hall, certainly for more than the five of you. It is really meant for the whole world. We want to have our right to get the Protection of the law for our religious beliefs and practices recognised. Let the government repent and say that we have seen the error of our way. (Turning to Mr. Ross Alston) : These are the words which my friend Mr. Ross Alston wanted me to say as my last words, and they shall be my last words—but with regard to the action proper for the government (Laughter). But will the government say that ? Is it going to abide by that pledge of

freedom of faith ? or, would the government say—No, we are powerful, we are strong, we have dreadnoughts, we have aeroplanes, we have all this soldiery, we have machine-guns, we have beaten the most powerful nations in Europe, though, of course, with the help of twenty-six allies (Laughter) and India's men, money, and other resources but that is another story (Laughter)—we cannot tolerate your religious opinion and acts. If they say that, we can understand that. Therefore, it is not for the purpose of defending ourselves but it is to make this issue clear because it is a national issue, nay, more than that, it is an issue on which the history of the world to a great extent depends—whether in this civilised century man's word shall be deemed more binding than the word of God. The trial is not 'Mohammad Ali and six other versus the Crown ?' but 'God versus man'. This case is therefore between God and man. That is the trial. The whole question is 'shall God dominate over man or shall man dominate over God' ?

Now, gentlemen, you were here though it was not intended for you—you happened to be here—when we refused to stand up when the Judge asked us to do so. We have always dissociated ourselves from and repudiated the idea of showing any disrespect to the Judge. We are not foolish enough to create any unnecessary unpleasantness or to worry the Judge or irritate him. We have no grudge against him. Bu estion was with regard to respect to a man as against respect to God. As my brother has said in the lower Court, and as I say before you now, we do not recognise the King any longer as our King—we do not owe any loyalty to any man who denies our right to be loyal to God. I have not a word to say against the Royal family. But where the question of god comes in as against the government, I cannot have any respect for a government when the government demands from me that I must not first respect God and His laws. Therefore, the whole question really is, as I have said, between God and man. The public prosecutor has very skilfully stated his case and when he came to our religious beliefs and the commandments of God, he was anxious to get over it as quickly as possible. He was skating over thin ice : He brushed all that aside. Now, I challenge him, I challenge the Judge to give a decision on the point. It is not at all a question of fact with which you, gentlemen of the Jury, have to deal. If the Judge deals with the question of law in his summing up and sentences us, if the verdict of the Jury goes against us in the case in which you act as Jurors, and if he exercises his right as Judge to decide both as regards the facts and the law in the cases in which you give your opinion as Assessors, if he sentences us disregarding our religious obligation, then our course will be clear. It does not matter what punishment we are likely to get and under what section of the Penal Code we get it, as there are any number or Sections 121 (B), 131, 109, 505, 117 and so on.

As regards those sections and the various charges, so far as I am concerned, I was greatly confused, and I am trying to compute how many years altogether I shall get (Laughter). I have but one life and I do not know

if it can cover the many years that I shall get if I am punished according to my deserts (Laughter). But that is absolutely immaterial.

The whole thing is this. I want a decision from the court on behalf of this government that the courts of India cannot give any protection to a man who does the thing that I have done, though it admits that it is precisely the thing that his religion demands, his God demands from him. God is not clamouring from the housetop. He is shouting from His eternally high throne-clamouring from there : 'Man whom I have created from just a clot of blood, whom I raised to whatever power and glory you possess, whatever you have and whatever you are, it is I who gave it to you and made all this for you—I want you to serve Me and not a creature of Mine.' Whatever respect I may have for the King, I may not bow before him when he asks me not to bow before my God and His commandments.

The Judge had hinted something about the beliefs of some sects. He said, suppose a sect of the Hindus demands human sacrifice. It is not a question of individual belief that was involved in our case. Then the public prosecutor had said, we had different sects among ourselves. We quarrelled among ourselves as to which of these is right and which is wrong. Well, it is not a question of our belief alone ; it is the question of the belief of every Muslim. But even if it was a case of a particular sect, do you mean to say that the Proclamation of the Queen in 1858 required at that time that each and every one of the 300 millions of the people of India must be agreed, all the heavens and the whole earth and all the planets and the men in the moon and all the men in Mars, every one must be agreed that this was the one true and correct faith and it was then that the Queen's Proclamation provided protection ? No protection would have been required for such a faith. What is the Penal Code itself for ? It is to give you the protection that I seek that I may not hurt your religious feelings. In today's *New Times* we find that some men—Khilafat men—have been prosecuted in Calcutta because they hurt the religious feelings of a policeman (Laughter) by aking him to resign government service (Laughter). I have not the least doubt that these men will be condemned, but see there is a provision of law even for protecting a policemen's religious feelings. Take another case. A little piece of stone which some men worship with full intensity—with as much intensity as my own when I say my prayers, possibly with greater intensity than mine—you do not approve of it—you heartily disapprove of it and want to remove it. But can you do it ? You cannot. The law gives the man who worships it its protection. Why does it do so ? It is not because the man's religion is good but because of the man's feelings. Because the framers of the law say that it is not good religion that they seek to protect but the man's religious feelings. It is not the objective religion but the subjective feelings of the man too that have to be protected. It is this that Lord Macaulay and others sought to protect the religious feelings of a brother-man, however foolish and superstitious and wrong he may be. It is that you have got to

protect and the law provides this protection. But I base my case upon the Queen's Proclamation and the King's Proclamation. So the Judge has got to declare whether these Proclamations have any value in a law court or not. That picture (pointing to the picture of King Edward VII) is there to remind the Judge that he has to give us the protection of the King's law. You will take that law from him because you cannot either take the law from me or from my friend there (pointing to the Public Prosecutor). If you took your law from him you will be in a perilous state, truly a sad plight (Laughter). But in this case, it is not the case of any man's individual opinion or the opinion of a small number of Muslims though you cannot hurt their feelings, the religious feelings even of these. Here it is not a question of a sect but of a religion. No person who calls himself a Muslim can go outside this book (pointing to the Quran). Look at this translation in English. This book is full of repetitions. But you see what a small book it is in spite of its repetitions, altogether it is only about 500 pages. It is this book which constitutes the chief source of our religious laws. I wish to explain this so that there may not be any misunderstanding. You ought to know where my religion is to be found. I do not take it from any individual's beliefs. My religion is all contained in the first instance in this tiny volume. Then come the traditions of our Prophet. But about this original source (pointing to the Quran) there is not a single sect of Muslims that differs about a single syllable. Therefore, you will find that here is a solid bedrock of our faith about which there is no difference of opinion. In the case of the Prophet's tradition, even if one of the companions of the Prophet said that the Prophet said so and so and if that tradition, handed down from his companions, is against or in contravention of anything contained in this book, no Muslim will accept that tradition. We shall not believe anything that is attributed to the Prophet, if it is against the Quran. But if it (the Quran) explains it or supplements it *adjuvandi causaer supplendi causaer*, we may accept it.

There is nothing which is required by a man's religion which can be an offence in British India as long as the Proclamation holds. You cannot in this country ask a Hindu to kill a cow. Before enlisting recruits you have to take people's answers down and you bind them by a certain oath. This is the form (showing the form) upon which the soldiers are enlisted. People take the oath that they will abide by their pledge. Yet not a single Hindu soldier who takes that oath will kill a cow in spite of all the allegiance that he might owe to the King. Therefore, if his officer commands him to kill a cow and the Hindu soldier refuses it, will he be hauled up before this court ? If the Commander orders a Hindu or a Muslim soldier to use cow or swine greased cartridges—which the Hindus and the Muslims won't touch and refuse to do it—could he be brought before any court of law ? The Queen's Proclamation will give him the protection, no matter what your Penal Code might say. So long as what I do is enjoined by my religion, no Indian Penal Code or other penal law can touch me because the Queen's Proclamation is there. As long

as the Queen's successor is the ruler, as long as the King's picture is here, you, the Judge, will have to take your order from the Queen's Proclamation and the King's, otherwise I will know that the whole thing was a camouflage, and that all his talk about tolerance was sheer cant and hypocrisy. Now, in this form you will see there is a question (reads the form) 'Are you willing to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow caste usage not to interfere with your military duty ?' I take it that every soldier at the time of enlistment has got to answer this in the affirmative and to sign this form. That does not allow the Commandant to believe that the religious cammandment is therefore binding on a soldier. Supposing the man is asked to kill a cow by his officer to provide beef for him. The man absolutely refuses that and he quotes scriptures and Shastras. No section of your Penal Code will ever assist the Judge or the Jury to declare that this man would be punished because he is acting according to his religion. Say that he can be punished, and I sit down. Now, gentlemen, you have to write on every section throughout the Penal Code and every other law, the favourite phrase of the lawyers 'without prejudice,' *i.e.* 'without prejudice to a man's religion'. You say that there are bad customs like '*Satee*' which he cannot allow. Then you should declare the customs which you will allow and the conditions on which you will be tolerant. Even murder is not murder if the man's religion demands it. And the Queen gave the law's protection by the Proclamation to that religion. You say there are many religions and sects in this country. Well, then you should have proclaimed that such and such religions shall receive protection. You should have made it clear that on these conditions alone whosoever wants to live within this Empire will be allowed to live and be regarded as a loyal subject. Whoever did not want to live within the orbit of this loyalty, that man would either have walked out of this Empire or would have kicked you out of it. My friend (the public prosecutor) told you that we are very sincere, that we are people who are straightforward. I am thankful to him for this compliment. But he did this for his own purpose and I am going to use it for my purpose now. Gentlemen, you will now understand that we are not the people who are going to be easily frightened into telling untruths to escape punishment if we deserve it on the evidence laid before you. Whatever evidence there is in this case is of a trivial character and I will not worry you about these trivial things. Islam is not going to bother about the evidence regarding the time we left the Kenyashala or returned to it or about the Subject Committee which was led to prove our association. Association with whom ? Association with my brother : In that case the public prosecutor could similarly have given the whole of past history and with his chronological order should have placed the evidence before you that my brother was present at my birth; that we lived together in the same home; that he took away my pocket money when we were in school and when I demanded back my money he beat me black and blue (Laughter). All this, gentlemen of the Jury, is trivial evidence. The main case is, does the Queen's Proclamation

give protection to the Muslim religion or not ? My whole contention is that if we ask the Muslim soldier to give up serving in the British Army and to refuse to recruit and ask other people not to be recruited and we say and prove that it is to be found in the Quran, then we are immune. You cannot punish us. Where the Penal Code is not opposed to the Quran, it stands. When the Penal Code is in antagonism to the Quran, it does not stand. It must go. That is the whole case. If I am wrong in this, let the Judge decide. I will be contented. You, gentlemen, must not take what the prosecution says about individual opinion as affecting our case, though even in that case we have got to think of the man's religious feelings. I have given you seventeen or eighteen out of the thirty-four Hadises and six verses from the Quran cited by Maulana Husain Ahmad Sahib. From these very citations the gentlemen of the Jury and the Presiding Judge may understand very clearly what a Muslim must not do. The public prosecutor has talked of verses cited without their contexts. It was to avoid this that I have given long extracts from the Quran so that you may be easily able to understand the context. I say, ask Muslim of any sect, send for any man, even the Court chaprasi, and ask him to say if what I say is written in the Quran or not. He will easily point it out for you if he can read the Quran, and if he knows Arabic he will explain it to you. There would be no difference of opinion. I challenge the government, I challenge the prosecution to produce any man, to any juridical opinion or *Fatwa* to show that what we declared is wrong.

Now, genetlemen, I want to say something about the charges. It is not for you, gentlemen, nor for me, to object to the misjoinder of charges. If I am to address anyone that point, I shall address the Judge. I think I am within my rights if I refer to this. But so far as you are concerned, I may tell you, gentlemen, that any number of sections 109, 117, 120(B), 131, 505 of Indian Penal Code have been jumbled together for the purpose of creating confusion—though section 233 of the Criminal Procedure Code lays down that these several charges cannot be jointed. Section 233 runs thus (reads section 233 and 234).

The Court : I do not think you should trouble yourself in reading this to the Jury. There cannot be any recasting of the charges at this late stage.

Mahommed Ali : The general rule is that the individuals should be separately tried and the charges should be separately dealt with, because if this is not done it will prejudice the accused and it will prejudice the gentlemen of the Jury. I do not know why they are jumbled together, but it seems to me that all representing the Crown have criminally .conspired (Laughter) so that so many sections of the law have been brought in only to confuse everybody. I do not know whether any of you, gentlemen, have understood them clearly. I did not quite understand what was the first charge, and what was the second charge, what was to go before the Judge and before you as Assessors. It was not quite clear until today. When I was being

brought here from Waltair, one of the policemen escorting me in the special train asked me with what offence I had been charged. I did not know but told him that my warrant had recited sections 120, 131, 205 and 117. The policeman drolly remarked : 'They may apply as many as they like, for after all they are home-made sections.' (Laughter). I wonder if any of you, gentlemen, have played billiards. Well, there are balls in billiard and you score by hitting your ball in such a way that it hits the other two or hits another and then drops into one of the pockets attached to the table or forces the other balls into these pockets. But sometimes these cursed balls lie on the table in such a manner that you don't know what to do with them to score and this happens infernally or frequently to the beginner. Well, the advice that you will in such a case get from the more experienced is to hit hard and trust the rest to luck (Laughter), and, not unoften, one scores. What is called a fluke in your opponent's case and a very difficult stroke, of course, in your own way (Laughter). Well, gentlemen, that is precisely what the prosecution has done with these charges. It has hit hard and trusts you and the Judge for a score. Out of so many sections one or two may manage to stick (Laughter). The whole thing so far as I understand, is that there are two main offences with which we are charged. The first offence is an agreement constituting criminal conspiracy and the second is the attempt to commit an offence (after interruption by the Court), agreement to commit criminal offence which makes it a criminal conspiracy and, secondly, to commit and act in pursuance of that conspiracy. These are the first two charges. Then comes the question of my statement, which was likely to seduce the troops from their loyalty. Then, of course, comes the abetment by the several co-accused. I am told the only thing that will go before you as Jury will be the attempt in pursuance of that conspiracy. But I will take up the first charge first—as regards an agreement. I am not quite sure whether any of you, gentlemen, know that these sections 120 (A), and 120 (B) were added to the Penal Code not so very long ago and I happened to be present in the Council meeting in which the Conspiracy Bill was passed. I was sitting in the press gallery, during the lunch interval, when my old friend Sir William Vincent came into the hall of the Council I was sitting with a distinguished journalist who has since become a Moderate leader and a particular friend of government. Sir William Vincent asked me jovially if we two were conspiring. I said to him, 'For conspiring an agreement is necessary, and as you know only too well, I never agree with anybody' (Laughter). And gentlemen of the Jury, truly enough there has been no agreement. No evidence has been led about agreement, whether here or in the lower Court. 'It is a matter of presumption,' says the public prosecutor. And it is really upon 'Presumption' that they are going to transport me for life—to take me away from my family, to take me away from my girls, to take me away from my wife and aged mother, to take me away from my country, which is still more important to me. And all this on a matter of 'presumption' ! Not a single witness comes in to say that there

was even a discussion about it. I am not quite sure whether the Judge was filling the gaps in the evidence by asking us question about this. Anyhow I said in reply that we never discussed the question about the troops. We are told by the prosecution that the accused knew more than the prosecution knows so very little (Laughter) and they pretend to increase their knowledge with the assistance of the inventions of the police (Laughter). Yes, the accused knew what the prosecution does not. But have they not put all their cards on the table before the committing Magistrate ?.

You, gentlemen, have had a long recitation in this Court when the clerk of the Crown read my statement made in the Lower Court. In that statement I showed very clearly the whole genesis of these prosecutions, and I hope you listened to it very carefully. Well, I am supposed to be a very frank man—we are very frank people, *ex-hypothesi*, you will take it that we are truthful people, also. So far as any agreement to tell the Muslim troops in India—even what the law of Islam is concerned, there was none beyond this resolution before you. But the day a man calls himself a Muslim he is bound to abide by what is contained in the Quran. If one single syllable of it I reject, I am not a Muslim. I may be the worst sinner. I may be, no matter however so, sinful I will still be so long as I do not reject anything out of this book I will still be a Muslim. But the moment I reject this, however pious of otherwise I may be, I am not a Muslim. And whatever is contained in the Quran I am required by the same law of the Quran to go and preach to everybody in the world—even to non-Muslims. Take the case of my revered friend here, Maulana Husain Ahmad Sahib. He has been teaching in Medina—he is the disciple of Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan Sahib, the late Shaikh-ul-Hind. It was from the Hejaz that he was arrested and taken to Egypt and then to Malta. He was teaching at Medina for ten years. He taught there the Prophet's traditions. Supposing he sits outside his house and he reads the Quran and he reads those very verses that 'Whoever kills a Muslim wilfully will find his reward in Hell. He will abide therein for ever. God will be wrathful with him. God will curse him. And God had prepared for him a severe torment.' supposing when he was reciting this a Muslim soldier was passing there. Will you say that Maulana Husain Ahmad has committed a crime under section 505, Indian Penal Code ? If you will say this, then why all this tall talk about toleration ? Or suppose a Muslim sepoy came to a mosque: would the Maulana a criminal because he recited this verse in the service while that soldier was there ? Take another case, a sepoy comes to him and says, 'Maulana, I want to know what is the law of Islam: I am required to go to Mesopotamia to fight against the Khalifa ? Is it lawful for me to go there and fight against Muslims ?' The Maulana says it is unlawful and if he says it is lawful, then he becomes a Kafir. If he keeps silent, God will curse him and the whole world will curse him. Therefore, he will have to say, 'No, it is not lawful'. It is his duty as religious teacher when a man comes in and asks him what is the Islamic law, to explain to him truly the law of Islam, but if he cannot, for

fear of the Penal Ccde, tell the truth, then curse of God comes in.

Take another case. The Maulana goes in a train and finds Muslims going to Mesopotamia to fight against other Muslims and the Khalifa or against people who are waging Jehad. The Maulana tells them, it is unlawful, this is not allowed by Islam. The Prophet says, 'Do not become Kafir by killing each other.' Will you give the Maulana no protection of the law ? You may say well, it is all right for him to say this when somebody comes, and asks him what is the Islamic law, it is all right for him to say so as a religious teacher. But it is not his duty to go to the housetop and proclaim it from there. Then it would be seduction. Then it would come under section 505 and section 177, or for the matter of that 121 (A), or 121 (B), I say that *even that is intolerance.* Because the Quran lays down clearly who will receive salvation and who will not (quotes the Quran). I am quoting that small chapter of the Quran in which God swears by the world's history. In that God says—'I swear by the world's history—I swear by all the time that has passed before' that all are certainly in perdition but the faithful who will do good works and tell other people to do the right thing and to have fortitude in case they are not successful. The four conditions required for a Muslim to win salvation are contained in this, the shortest chapter of the Quran. A man's salvation depends upon these; that he must act upon that faith. A man who believes in Islam, says his prayers, gives alms, fasts in the Ramazan, goes to Mecca and does not hurt anybody. Do you think that he will have salvation with only this ? No ! Because the Quran says that the third step too you must take—that you must go and preach those good things to everybody. You must go and propagate these doctrines. You are not born to save only yourself. You are here to save your neighbours as well. Therefore the three things that a Muslim must do are that he must believe, he must act according to his belief, and he must also propagate that belief. If a Muslim says that he believes that killing another Muslim is *haram* and yet goes and kills him, he may not win salvation. But he is nevertheless a Muslim if he really believes that he is Kafir. But suppose he believes that it is *haram* and does not kill another Muslim, he may not yet win salvation if he sits idly and lets, others kill him. But if he is not idle and goes and tells others people also that it is *haram*, then too he may not win salvation, unless he persists in his propaganda even if his efforts fail. If he fails in his propaganda and he suffers because of section 505 and section 117 and is sent to Jail—what is he to do ? He must show fortitude ? He may be hanged, he may be drowned, he may be quartered. But he must show fortitude and perseverance in his mission. Then only will he win salvation and escape perdition. He must not try to change God's law by one single syllable. He must abide by it and face all the consequences.

Gentlemen, it is not such and easy thing to go to paradise and claim the embraces of the Houries. By clipping one's moustache and growing a long beard and muttering prayers one does not become a Muslim. He has got to

do all those things but he has got to do many other things besides, because we are required to do all these things by our religion. It is not enough that I should not go to war. I have got to go and induce other Muslims also not to go to war to fight their brothers. I shall induce them in every possible way. I must take the rifle out of his hand—but not by force, not by compulsion but by clearly expounding our religious law. We are saved only when we have saved these people from going to fight and kill other Muslims.

Gentlemen, a military gentleman, like Colonel Gwyer in this case, went to Bombay. His name is Colonel Beach. On the 20 October, so a telegram in the *Pioneer* tells us, this gallant officer who had gone down from Army Headquarters at Simla, met the members of my profession perhaps to seduce them from their duty (Laughter)—editors of local newspapers and news agencies in a round table conference and among other things what this military officer said was the following with reference to the arrest of Ali Brothers, though the matter is still *sub judice* (reads from a paper) : 'Referring to the arrest of the Ali Brothers, Colonel Bach speaking as a soldier said that it would be worth while asking those who are trying to seduce soldiers to consider for a moment if a soldier who once turns a deserter would be loyal to any other cause to which he was won over.' That was Colonel Beach speaking, as he tells you, as a soldier. Well done, Colonel Beach (Laughter). Almost sound doctrine and a remarkably good logic for soldier (Laughter). But speaking not as a soldier but as a Muslim, may I ask who is the seducer ? Every child born into this world is a soldier of God and it is men like Colonel Beach and Colonel Gwyer who are first the seducers that seducehim from his first duty and his sole allegiance. May we not equally ask these Beaches and Gwyers if God's soldiers who once turned deserters would be loyal to them and to their cause to which they had been won over ? A man's first duty is to his God. The Quran tells us that before men's souls were put into their bodies they were asked by God : Am I not your Lord ?' and they answered in unison, 'Aye'. Well, hang all the souls, gentlemen. There, was all the agreement that you need for a criminal conspiracy under sections 120 (A) and 120 (B) (Laughter). No, gentlemen, it is your Beaches of the Army Headquarters of Simla and your Gwyers of the Western Command that seduce soldiers from their duty. If you have any faith, if you have any belief in God, then your first duty, your prior allegiance is to God. Is it not the duty of Christians who believe in Christ ? Is it not the belief of the Hindus ? Is it not a Hindu's, first duty to obey Lord Krishna ? Still we talk of allegiance to kings, still we talk of loyalty. An Englishman—not a Muslim but a Christian, Mr. H. G. Wells, wrote a book after the war—a sort of allegory of the whole British nation—I do not know whether any of you has read it. It is called 'Mr. Brittling Sees it Through' and what does he say ? What does Mr. Brittling, who is supposed to be the average Englishman, see through that terrible war ? He says that religion is the first thing and it is the last thing. A man who does not begin with it has not lived a true life, has not found the true meaning of the life. His only

allegiance—his only duty is to God. He might have the scraps of honour, he may have his fragments of loyalty; but when it comes to the test of loyalty to God—all these fragmentary loyalties, all these scraps of honour, they are like a mere scrap of paper passed through fire that shrivels up and is scattered to the four winds or merely blackens a man's hand as so much dirt. That is what an average Englishman has seen through this war and publicly said. And it is after this war that God's law is to be brushed aside for us in India because man's law—120(B) and 131 and 505 and 117—is to prevail over God's law. When I have Swaraj I will see to it that I do not let anyone seduce my fellow countrymen from their true loyalty. But so long as I want to reside in British India, I claim the protection of the Queen's Proclamation. If I were a Hindu I would have said the same thing. What was Christ supposed to have said—(interrupted. The Court rose for the day in the midst of the sentence). Well, gentlemen, the Court stops me at 'Christ', I shall tell you to-morrow what Christ is supposed to have said.

(The next day Maulana Mahommed Ali continuing his address to the Jury said):

Gentlemen of the Jury, I was explaining to you that the Proclamation of the Queen made in 1858—confirmed by the late King Edward in the Proclamation made on the fiftieth anniversary of the Queen's Proclamation and also confirmed by a letter addressed to the princes and people of India by King George after his accession to the throne—gave the protection of the law to His Majesty's subjects in British India with regard to their réligious beliefs and religious practices, and I was telling you that was the whole of our case. And that whatever may be an offence according to the Penal Code or for the matter of that any other Code, if any person—be he Hindu or Muslim or Christian—does a thing which his religion requires him to do, then even if that is an offence under the Penal Code or any other law that is enforced in British India, that law cannot stand in his way and he cannot be punished. The law gives him its protection as stated in these three proclamations. But it is not his words that you are to take; he has got to prove it that his religion requires it. He has got to explain it. As I have told you yesterday, this trial because after all the clear issue involved in it is whether God's law is to prevail or whether man's law is to override God's law, whether Queen's Proclamation has any value, whether the King's solemn pledge has any value or not, whether the Judge is bound by it, whether the Jury is bound by it or not. It will not be possible for me to explain my case when the Judge has summed up. I do not know how he is going to sum up. But it is on this point that the Judge's summing up will be of importance. You cannot take the law either from the public prosecutor or from me. But at the same time I ask you to understand, gentlemen of the Jury, that if you to-day deny a Hindu or a Muslim or a Christian his right to do his duty to God, to do what his faith enjoins him to do what his religion demands of him to do, then, I say, you yourselves will be a party to the destruction of religious freedom enjoyed in this country and

given by the Queen's Proclamation. It is not a question oi a particular faith, it is not a question of the Hindu faith or the Christian faith or the Jewish faith. Every faith, even that of a sceptic, even that of an atheist, has to be protected, but the freedom of all these people will be taken away and, I ask you, will you be a party to this? I was telling you yesterday what Mr. H. G. Wells has said in his book 'God, the Invisible King' and also in another book of his, a novel, 'The Soul of a Bishop'.

He writes : A saying has been attributed to the Master Jesus Christ (on whom be peace), 'Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and render unto God what is God's.' And then he asks who is the Caesar that wants to share this world with God ? What is Caesar's that is not at the same time God's ? The world is not divided into two parts – one God's and the other Caesar's. No, there are not the two kings of Brentford. God is the sole ruler. And if the king or any other human creature, be he the head of republic or the Judge or a member of the Jury, demands from you anything he must demand for God and through God. If they demand from you anything which is against God, then that demand is not to be satisfied. It is God alone whose demand is to be satisfied. This, says Mr. H.G. Wells, is coming to be the universal modern religion. Whether it is that or not, it is certainly the religion of every Muslim. It is not a question of my individual faith. My own whims and indiosyncrasies. I challenge the Government– I challenge the public prosecutor to produce any man in this trial—to produce any Muslim who could say that, inspite of what God says.

Therefore, you have got to see to this that every Muslim who lives in British India anywhere that a Muslim dwells—he is under the protection of the Queen's Proclamation. He is to follow the law of the land but without prejudice to his faith. When he were interned we said the same thing to the Viceroy as we are telling you now. When they wanted to release us from internment, but on certain conditions, that we shall do this and not do the other, we said we shall agree to those conditions, but without prejudice to our faith. Again, as long ago as the 9 July 1929, we sent a letter through the Superintendent of Betul Jail, where we were confined to the Viceroy. Therein we said : 'But since government is apparently uninformed about the manner in which our Faith colours and is meant to colour all our actions, including those which, for the sake of convenience, are generally characterised as mundane, one thing must be made clear, and it is this : Islam does not permit the believer to pronounce and adverse judgment against another believer without convincing proof, and we could not, of course, fight against our Muslim brothers without making sure that they were guilty of wanton aggression, and did not take up arms in defence of their faith.'

This is precisely what in September 1917 we had told the Hon'ble the Raja Sahib of Mahmudabad who had visited us at Chhindwara and had referred to the possibility of foreign aggression; and he had thereupon wired to Simla to the Hon'ble Mr. Jinnah apparently for communication to the government

that he was entirely satisfied about our political attitude. We do not want a change of masters but we do want the speedy establishment of a government responsible to the united people of India, and we hoped we have made matters clear beyond the possibility of any doubt or misunderstanding.

One thing more has to be made more clear as we have since discovered that the doctrine to which we shall now revert is not so generally known in non-Muslim and particularly in official circles as it ought to be. A Muslim's faith does not consist merely in believing in a set of doctrines and living up to that belief himself; he must also exert himself to the fullest extent of his power of course without resort to any compulsion, to the end that others also conform to the prescribed beliefs and practices. This is spoken of in the Holy Quran as *Amr bil-maroof* and *Nahi-anil-munker* and certain distinct chapters of the Holy Prophet's traditions relate to this essential doctrine of Islam. A Muslim cannot say : 'I am not my brother's keeper,' for in a sense he is and his own salvation cannot be assured to him unless he exhorts others also to do good and exhorts them against doing evil. If, therefore, any Muslim is being compelled to wage war against the Mujahid of Islam, he must not only be a 'conscientious objector' himself, but must, if he values his own salvation, persuade his brothers also at whatever risk to himself to take similar objection. Then, and not until then, can he hope for salvation. This is our belief as well as the belief of every other Muslim, and in our humble way we seek to live to it, and if we are denied freedom to inculcate this doctrine we must conclude up that the land where this freedom does not exist is not safe for Islam.

Now, this was the first charge we had brought against the government. 'During the war Muslims have been required, in defence of their religious obligations', mark the words, gentlemen, 'to assist government in waging war against the Khalifa and those engaged in Jehad.' And what do you think the Viceroy did ? He did not hang us under Section 121 for waging war against the King. He did not transport us for life under Section 131. He simply got us out of internment and arranged that I should go to England and explain the same Islamic law there to the Prime Minister and to other members of the Cabinet. But for the same we are now tried for criminal conspiracy; what is the special offence in our case ? What becomes of the case against the thousands and hundreds of thousand millions of people who are saying the same thing today ? Why are they not with us ? I have complained about the misjoinder of charges because too many accused are tried for too many offences. But you have not room enough in this hall—nay in any hall—to try each and every one of those together who say that it is his belief too, that it is his Dharma also. As I have said so often, it is not a question of individual belief. I, who lived with Englishmen, who went to England to be educated at Oxford—I who was most friendly with the English people, even I have got to say it because it is a religious duty, even I have got to say that no Muslim should serve in the British Army where he is forced to kill his own brethren for the advancement of unrighteousness. I said it then, and I say it now, that it is religiously unlawful.

I said it then, I say it now, and I shall say it all the time. It does not matter if I am hanged for it and I hope when I am dead and gone, my carcass will shout out from the grave that it is the faith of the Muslims.

However, I now come to the first charge against us on which you have to sit here merely as Assessors. You have been told and have seen for yourselves that not a single witness was put into the box to prove that there was at any time any agreement. My friend here asked you to take that on presumption. What a presumption ! Are you going to hang us merely for this presumption for which there is not the slightest piece of evidence, absolutely none ?

No man, not a single witness, has said that he ever saw us, heard us or suspected us to be conspiring, agreeing to commit any offence. I was in England in the month of February 1920, and probably on the very day I was interviewing the officiating Secretary of State when a conference was held in Calcutta in which certain resolutions were passed. That was the evidence against me. Presumption has to do duty for proof and any evidence is sufficient to transport us for life. Gentlemen, I may tell you that I knew nothing about the conspiracy. When my brother went to Assam I did not know. I did not know of it until the public prosecutor got up and said that he would bring in a witness to prove this. It was for the first time I learnt that my brother had gone there. The rascal ! He goes there without my knowledge and I am to be transported for life. That's the worst of being a younger brother (Laughter). But even that is no proof of agreement to commit a criminal offence. You cannot presume that. It must be proved and proved without a shadow of doubt. As for the Karachi Conference, my brother could have got off on the score of not having spoken. But the public prosecutor can fill that gap too. In Australia there was a farmer who had a son—and I am afraid—not a very clever son. People, heartlessly, even called him fool, and wherever his father took him, through his folly the father got into a sort of disgrace. Once the father was invited to a feast and the son wanted to go too. But the father refused. He was afraid that his son would speak and would be found to be a fool and he would be once more disgraced. The son then promised that he would not utter a single syllable. And so his father at last consented to take the fool to the feast. The son went there and sat in a snug corner. Several persons put him several questions but the son did not utter a single syllable in reply. So when a man was putting him another question one of the guests said : 'What is the use of asking this man any question, can't you see that he is a fool ?' The son immediately shouted out at the top of his voice, addressing his father, who was at the other end of the table, 'Father, father, they have found it out, but I did not speak' (Laughter). So the public prosecutor too has found it out that my brother was a conspirator at the Karachi Conference though he did not speak (Laughter). The public prosecutor has said that we are earnest people. By the same token, gentlemen, we are truthful people. And, although I am not a witness deposing on oath, I say it that there was

never at any time any discussion among ourselves about the declaration of Islamic law regarding the Muslim troops serving in the British Army. The Judge put me this question and I said that there was no discussion at any time. Why should there be a discussion about it at all ? Supposing tomorrow we hold a conference of the Muslims assembled together in Karachi and declare that there is no God but one God and Muhammad is His Prophet. Do you think it will be necessary for us to sit together and come to agreement ? The moment that I say that I am a Muslim there is that agreement. But there cannot be any time limit to it. It cannot be only between February 1920 and September 1921; of course you know the addition to the period of the charge was the particular gift of my little friend there (pointing to Mr. Ross Alston). There was no mention of 1920 before the committing Magistrate. This is slight alteration that my slight friend has made to the charge which means twelve months more added to the period of the charge of conspiracy against us. So, believe me, there was no agreement except the agreement that we are Muslims. Every Muslim the moment he says that he is a Muslim and accepts the example and the precepts of our Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (God's peace and benedictions be upon him), that very moment he agrees to this also, that it is unlawful to enlist or remain in an army which must wage war against and kill Muslims without just cause. And the Resolution passed at the Conference of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema was nothing new that they resolved and declared. What discussion or agreement was required for the 'Ulema' to declare the well known law of Islam against the killing of Muslims, or to sign a Fatwa or juridical pronouncement ? Similarly, what discussion or agreement did the two Muslims, who are our co-accused, need before speaking on the Resolution here ? They were asked to declare the Shariat and they did it. What related to the army was not a resolution but a declaration of law. But there was a resolution, too, a solemn resolve and determination that if the British government, directly or indirectly, secretly or openly, takes any hostile action against the government of Angora, the Muslims of India would be obliged to take to Civil Disobedience in concert with the Congress and to make a declaration at the forthcoming Congress at Ahmedabad in December of Indian Independence and of the establishment of a Republic. Gentlemen, we had provided not only for openly hostile action against Angora on the part of British but also for secret action, not only for direct British action but also for indirect action through the Greeks. Yes, we know only too well our English diplomacy. At Oxford they define Association and Rugby football in this manner : 'Soccer is a game in which you kick the man if you can't kick the ball. In Rugger you kick the ball if you can't kick the man' (Laughter). In England they want to down every other nation and particularly the Turks. But rule like Rugger is that they will fight themselves, only if they can't get another to fight their battle (Renewed laughter). Gentlemen, we said that in the event of reopening of hostilities against the Angora government, it will be our duty in

concert with the Indian National Congress, in concert with our fellow countrymen, to start Civil Disobedience and that if this sort of thing goes on, it will be our duty—a duty of tremendous responsibility—the responsibility of declaring absolute freedom and independence of India, to establish an independent republic of India. This was not said in a light vein, as a jest or mere bluff. This was a very serious matter indeed. We knew what we were about. Every mother's son among us may be hanged for it. We could have been shot down instead of being brought down to this hall and having this farce of a trial—the Judge and the Jury and all this paraphernalia—instead of this lengthy circuitous route, there could be a short cut—no prosecution, no Judge, no Jury, but only a firing party at dawn led by Col. Gwyer or Col. Beach and a chatter of rifles and there would be an end of the matter.

However, we did declare this and in consideration of that grave matter we determined that in concert with our fellow countrymen, we would do either of these two things or both. The prosecution, however, is not for that. It is for the earlier portion of the Resolution which is cited in the order of the Government sanctioning the prosecution. But the previous portion of the Resolution is not stated in its entirety. That Resolution says : 'This meeting further plainly declare that according to the Islamic Shariat it is strictly forbidden to serve or enlist in the British Army or to raise recruits.' Therefore the charge is that we declared the law of Islam and the declaration of the law of Muslims, if it is an offence, then, gentlemen, say so. In that case, if you declare the law of Christianity, that too is an offence. The Hindus following their own religious injunction declared the Hindu law, that is also an offence. Therefore, a number of men who demand from an Indian soldier that he must not kill a cow will be guilty of agreement to commit a criminal offence, that is to say, they will be guilty, of criminal conspiracy. Now I say if the declaration is an agreement, if to declare the laws of Islam is an offence and we are guilty, then say so. But this is a matter which the Judge has got to decide; only you will have to give your opinion as Assessors and it would rest with what you think best (Laughter). I think that is the law in regard to Assessors also (Laughter), always consult your wife, *i. e.* the Assessors, but do what you, the Judge, think best (Laughter). Gentlemen, bigamy for an Englishmen and a Christian is a crime and even a Muslim can have only four wives. But the Judge in this case has five wives that are to be consulted (Renewed laughter). But the Judge will do what he thinks best. I will still appeal to the Judge because he too has a soul to be saved like ours. I make no appeal to him for my own sake. I do not even appeal to the Jury for myself; I appeal to them for their own sake and have said to them whatever I had got to say in the matter. You will only decide upon the facts before you and let no man say that any outside influence was brought to bear upon your decision.

Now, I come to the charge which is before you as Jury. You are the sole judge here. You are 'Monarch of all you survey' here. I would not like

you to disagree in your finding. I hope you will agree whether your verdict be for us or whether you come to a finding against us. But let there be an agreement. Let it not be said that the Hindu jurors came to this finding and the Christian jurors came to that. Let it not be said that the gentlemen working in the Greek firm of Ralli Brothers gave this verdict and the gentlemen from Forbes, Forbes and Campbell gave that verdict. You should be united. I prefer that you should be united in a matter of grave importance like this. Let yourself be guided by your own conscience because that after all is the basic law of all faiths. You must do the right, you must act according to your conscience. Now, on this matter, I may again tell you, you are the sole monarch and the charge on which you are to give your verdict is the matter of attempt that is under Section 131 (Reads the sections).

The Court : You are charged with being members of a conspiracy which attempted to seduce the troops.

Maulana Mohammad Ali : We are charged with being members of a conspiracy, that is to say, charged with having agreed to commit a criminal offence, and in pursuance of that conspiracy, somebody within this conspiracy—some fellow conspirator—attempted these things. It does not matter whether we ourselves have attempted or some other persons have attempted. True. Well, Mr. Ross Alston of Allahabad (the Advocate-General of the United Provinces assisting the public prosecutor) gets somebody in Allahabad who gets printed somewhere and gets that someone to reproduce something from the Ulema's *Fatwa* although he is perfectly ignorant of the Quran. All this has to be carefully done. He gets an ignorant Maulvi to copy it—every Muslim feels and trembles when he has got to copy anything from the Quran lest he writes something different and attributes it to God falsely—the Maulvi copies it, gets it published for Mr. Ross Alston—gets it published in Allahabad or in Lahore; he gets the same kind of envelopes; the letters are posted from different places, but mostly from Allahabad where Mr. Ross Alston comes from (Laughter). And you have got to transport me for life for this. This is the thing which we are supposed to have done. What is the proof ? He (the public prosecutor) says, this is the proof. A poet says, 'the appearance of the sun is itself the proof of the sun.' So, in case too, what further proof is needed ? Well, the charge is that these leaflets were sent to Muslim soldiers. That they were posted mostly from Allahabad because some were posted from Cawnpore whence Maulana Nasir Ahmad Sahib, one of the accused, comes, the public prosecutor attributed them to him and to us. Well, Allahabad is the place where Mr. Ross Alston comes from, the place from which two C.I.D. officers who have deposed against us come—well, from that can you not have this presumption that it is Mr. Ross Alston who did it ? (Laughter). Well, if this thing (showing the leaflet) is sent round, is it by itself sufficient for you as men of any sense—you who are practically businessmen, is it sufficient for you to transport me for life, to take me away from my children, to take me away from my wife, to take me away from my mother, to take me

away from my country which is dear to me, to take me away from God's work, simply because they were posted mostly from Allahabad. Is that or is that not the whole offence ? Read it for yourself. Search for it in the entire record of evidence. If you are conscientious your Judgement must be right. You who are conscientious men, you who cannot kill a gnat for nothing, you are not going to transport six men for life—not six men, for at last we find we are to be seven—our revered friend Jagat Guru Shri Sankaracharya will also go with us Muslims because if there was no evidence against him, it was amply made up after all by the wrath of the perfectly peaceful public prosecutor. You saw that *Baresarkar* rage yourself. Not, of course, a real storm, mind you, from such a gentlemen but a fairly good and imitation of one, something just realistic enough to give us the impression that there was a storm at last with lightening and thunder, hail and wind—all this came from my peaceful and amiable friend there (Laughter). Are you going to commit all of us on the proof that there are certain envelopes and certain officers, from the army who received them ? Officers ? Euphemism could go no further. Yes, officers of courage in battle and length of service and medals and those real medals—not of silver hanging on their breasts, but medals of lead, lead bullets that found billets in their bodies and their breasts—so far as these are concerned, really and truly officers, but yet men who have got, even as veterans and heroes of a hundred battle-plains who salute the merest white tyro, the merest callow youth with hardly a moustache on his upper lip but only girlish peach-down because they themselves are brown and black. These are the people who come before you. They come and present before you these things, and say 'a most terrible thing has happened'. One verse—incorrectly transcribed verse from the Quran—was sent to us and even without opening these envelopes we scented that they were smelling gunpowder, smelling of 1857. We rushed to our Officer Commanding and said, 'Sir, save us from Islam; our feelings are hurt, our religious feelings are hurt. We are being reminded of our religion; we are being reminded of our God. For God's sake protect us from God ! Does not Queen's Proclamation give us protection ? We are being bombarded with the quotations from the Quran ! We can stand all bombardments but not this.' Is it on this evidence we are going to be transported for life ?

But gentlemen of the Jury, I do not want you to save me. I want you to be saved yourselves. This is the only evidence and nothing more—not a jot or title more than this. If there was any, our friend (the public prosecutor) would have told you. He has got to transport seven for life a large and long transportation indeed ! He took four hours in addressing you—practically a whole day, and thereby earned a day's fee, although his daily fee is perhaps greater than the monthly salaries of all you combined (interrupted).

Mohammad Ali (continuing said) : Well, gentlemen, this is the main thing for which you have been sworn in as a Jury and taken away from your work—five of you. Well, wherever you may come from, from Ralli Brothers or

Forbes, Forbes and Campbell or the Customs House, you are here for that purpose, otherwise only two gentlemen might have been brought in as assessors, as views of the Judge (Laughter). You are self-sufficient. You are the sole judge here as a Jury, though there are several other charges—there are sections more than one can number—there are Sections 120 (B), 117, 505 and so on—for which you act only as assessors. As you may remember, when the policeman asked me when I was being brought to Karachi, under what sections I was charged and I told him of all the charges. He said : Well, they are all home-made sections (Laughter) and they can apply as many as they like. So this is the only Jury charge, Section 120 (B) read with Section 131. This is as regards the leaflet containing an extract from the *Fatwa*. It is the Jamiat-ul-Ulema that signed this *Fatwa*. We are supposed to be every frank people, so we said this in the lower Court as well as in this Court that we were glad that the Jamiat-ul-Ulema were at last doing their duty. The Jamiat ul-Ulema is supposed to be a party to this conspiracy. But the government is very moderate. It has picked out only three Ulema for this trial. The government is astonished at its own moderation as Lord Clive said of his own moderation. Out of the 500 Ulemas who signed the *Fatwa* only two or three have been brought here. Well, why have not the others been prosecuted ? I thought that the Ulema who had done this would have been here. It is for the first time in my life that I saw this leaflet here. In fact, it was for the first time in my life a little while ago that I came to know of this *Fatwa* of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema on this matter though I knew of their resolution in their Conference at Delhi. However, it does not matter if I did not know others who conspired with me did know. That is no protection for me. And I do not seek any But In this case of attempt in pursuance of the conspiracy I thought the dear conspirators were the Jamiat-ul-Ulema. Whatever the conspiracy is, the Jamiat-ul-Ulema is a party to it and I said that at last the association of the Ulema was doing its religious duty. But I was immediately corrected by my friend, brother-in-law and legal adviser, though not my legal representative in this case—Mr. Muazzam Ali. He said : No, the Jamiat-ul-Ulema too deny the distribution and printing of these leaflets. So I turned round and said in the lower Court : Well, I am not correct myself, but I hope they will soon convert the forgery into a fact.

But it is the fact, gentlemen, that you have got to deal with facts and not with the forgery. Is it a fact that anybody is a member of the conspiracy who does this ? This is a presumption and not a fact. Well, gentlemen, clear your heads of all these cobwebs woven by the public prosecutor. It is nothing but throwing dust—good old Karachi dust (Laughter)—in your eyes. Nothing more than that.

I now come to Section 504 (reads it).

This is wider than Section 131, for I may not even preach to the Imperial Service troops of my own state of Rampur about their religious duty. What would my grandfather who was the 'right-hand man' as government itself

testified, of his master, the then Nawab Sahib of Rampur in 1857, and saved hundreds of Englishmen and Englishwomen at the risk of his own life and saved the U.P. Government—what would he have thought of this prosecution of his grandsons for declaring to the Rampur Pathans the law of Islam about sparing the lives of Muslims ? But that is another story. Well, gentlemen, Colonel Beach of the Army Headquarters, Simla, and Lord Macaulay have given me my cue (reads) with intent to cause or which it is likely to cause soldiers to disregard or fail in their duty as such. But what is their duty—the first duty of these soldiers which they must not disregard or fail in ? When a child is born in a family—if there is any faith in that family—the nurse should not say that a body or a girl is born, but that a new recruit is born in the army of God. That child must be the soldier of God. That is why the primeval souls were asked this question by God : 'Am I not your Lord ?' And they said 'Yes'. Gentlemen, I am tempted to recite a verse—a verse of my own—a poor thing but mine own—as Touchstone said, Cinna the poet was killed for Cinna the conspirator, when Caesar was murdered and the crowds had become mad through Mark Antony's rhetoric : 'No, no, I am not Cinna, the conspirator, I am Cinna the poet.' But they said, 'Then kill him for his bad verses' (Laughter). Gentlemen, don't transport me for life for my bad verses. I address my own fellow countrymen, my own coreligionists and I say to them—you are being reminded of your duty, you are being reminded of your allegiance, you are being reminded of your loyalty, you have given to government before your God and man—you are being reminded of your honour and you are asked to be faithful (recites a verse). Kindly carry out that first pledge that you gave to God while you are about it. You are loyal people. A little more loyalty will not be amiss. Can I not say to the Jury—if these people are not true to their God, can they be true to their King—(pindrop silence prevails in the house)—the God that gave them everything, life, honour, faith, loyalty itself—the God that has given them—the King. If they are not true to their God, they cannot be true to their king. I say God before everything—God before loyalty, God before King, God before patriotism, God before my father, mother and child. That is my faith. Hang me if you like. But having done that, gentlemen, you may commit suicide yourselves, also because then you would have murdered your own souls. You may walk and sit and stand and work. But your bodies would only be moving carcasses without souls, fit carrion, to provide food for the crows.

Gentlemen, it is the government it is they who want to seduce God's soldiers. We want to bring them back to their pristine loyalty. The law says that in any case there is an exception : 'It does not amount to an offence, within the meaning of this section, when the person making, publishing or circulating any such statement, rumour or report has reasonable ground for believing that such statement, rumour or report is true.'

The Court : Read out the whole section, Mr. Mohammad Ali.

Mohammad Ali : I will, sir, I will not leave out one jot or tittle. The

Government will have its pound of flesh. In the case of Shylock, they allowed him only the flesh, but they would not let him take a drop of Christian blood. But you can take that too from me, full measure and overflowing.

That exception requires that you establish that truth of the statement on reasonable ground for your belief in its truth and that you made it 'without any such intent as aforesaid'. There is no God but the one God and Muhammed is His Prophet. Is that my statement ? No it is the creed of all Muslims. It cannot be an offence to declare that creed even if it is likely to 'seduce' a man from his allegiance to a king or government that demands obedience from him in matters involving disobedience to God. Is it an offence to say so ? The next offence is asking ten persons or more to commit a similar offence. But for that too the first question is the question of statement. Whose statement ? It is not my statement of God. It is a declaration based on the law of the Quran. It is well known to every Muslim who understands the Quran. It is not a matter of my own opinion.

Now, I want to show what a man is required to do when he joins the army, what is and what is not his duty as a soldier (reads). Mark gentlemen, the question is 'Are you willing to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow no caste usage to interfere with your military duty ?' 'Will you do anything which is against your faith ?' or 'Will you have any objection when you will be asked to commit a sin ?' or 'Are you willing to go to hell by land or by sea ?' (Laughter). There is no question like that. The public prosecutor asked me—he said to me, if somebody believes in human sacrifice and your child is demanded, you will be the first to seek the protection of the law. In any case, as a non-cooperator in these days, I do not want to seek the protection of the law : neither do I believe that there is any sect that can demand such a sacrifice from other people. The only sect that can demand human sacrifice of other people's children is the sect of the Militarists. They demand it, their Moloch of greed demands it, their Moloch of Imperialism demands it, their greed for dominion demands it, they want that on the high seas—on God's big broad oceans, whenever a foreign ship passes one of theirs, it should dip its flag in recognition of the fact the England is 'the mistress of the seas'. It is these people who want such human sacrifice.

The Judge asked me, 'but what about the thief ? Do you want that the thief's hand should be cut off ?' I said if the government was an Islamic government, I would require this of it. I would have the adulterer stoned to death too, though adultery is no offence in English law. My bargain is as a Muslim with a non-Muslim government. From non-Muslims I do not require that they should do anything for me, except permit me to hold my own religious opinions and act up to them with impunity. My religion can impose its obligation only upon me and not upon others. There is an obligation upon me, to tell God's own truth that it is religiously forbidden to join the British army and to fight a Muslim without a just cause, and that it is unjust to kill a brother Muslim at the bidding of the government, which is next to

infidelity. The Prophet said that last thing that he said collecting all the people who had gone to the pilgrimage together, some 175 thousand people assembled together at Mina, and the Prophet asked, 'What day is it ?'... (Interrupted).

The Court : I would ask you to stop. Never mind about the Prophet.

Mohammad Ali (Indignantly) : I must mind about the Prophet. I think you should withdraw that.

Shaukat Ali : Blasphemy and impertinence.

Mohammad Ali : You must withdraw that. You must make amends. I have got to mind about the Prophet. I have to take a man's life who insults the Prophet.

The Court : You must stop. You cannot go on.

Mohammad Ali : I am doing what the law allows me. The law says that I am not to seduce troops from their duty. I say it is not a part of a Muslim soldier's duty to kill a brother Muslim. And I am here entitled to argue this till eternity. So long as I want to explain my position I have this right. Take away this right and end this farce. What is the use of this farce ? Take out a shooting party and shoot us out of hand, or if you prefer to keep up this farce of a trial try us after our death, as Lord Nelson once did. I say that no man is required to go against his religion—military duty does not inculcate this.

The Court : It is irrelevant.

Mohammad Ali : I have not yet done with Section 505 and have not even touched the charge under Section 117 against me. I have not said one word about that. Am I to be punished without saying one word about it.

The Court : I will not give you the right of speech.

Mohammad Ali : I am explaining what my religion says—I have given it in any statement in the lower Court. It is perfectly relevant.

The Court : Sit down.

Mohammad Ali : Will you show me a single sentence in your law book that the Judge has the power to take away that right ? You have already taken away one of my rights by not allowing me to make a statement before the prosecution addressed the Jury. Your own Bombay High Court says that and the public prosecutor agrees. I do not know if the Judicial Commissioner of Sind has laid down another law. Now, you are going to stop me again from addressing the Jury. You can object to a particularly part of my address. You can say—do not say this. But I cannot understand how you can stop me altogether by saying that you will not allow me to say anything more. (The Court kept on saying, 'Sit down, I won't hear you)'.

Mohammad Ali : I am explaining that it is not the law, that it is no part of a Muslim's duty to go against his religion. Have I not got to prove that this statement contained in the resolution is a true statement and not a false statement ? It is relevant.

The Court : It is not relevant.

Mohammad Ali : Do you think that you are authorised by law to take

that right from me ? The law says it does not amount to an offence within the meaning of the exception again.

The Court : ......'and ?'

Mohammad Ali : Never mind about 'and'. I am arguing that it is a true statement. I am not yet arguing about the intention.

The Court : I do not want to hear you.

Mohammad Ali : It is for the Assessors; at any rate you cannot take away the Assessors' right. They will have to give their opinion about this whether I am guilty or not. It is according to law. And the law says this (reads again). I cannot take your word for it. I cannot really I cannot take any man's word as against the clear provision of the law.

The Court : Argue your case.

Mohammad Ali : It is not your case that I am arguing (Laughter). Well, gentlemen of the Jury-(interrupted).

The Court : I do not want to hear you.

Mohammad Ali : You may not hear me as you have done on many other occasions. You have slept through a great deal of evidence that was being read out. You may sleep now. But I have got to address the Jury.

The Court (with apparent anger) : Will you sit down ?

Mohammad Ali : If I don't ?

The Court : I shall put you in custody.

Mohammad Ali : Do.

(The Superintendent of Police was here called to make the accused sit down but retired without touching him, leaving him standing.

The Court directed the Serishtadar to call accused No. 2, Maulana Husain Ahmad Sahib. The Serishtadar approaching called out, but Maulana Husain Ahmad did not utter a single word or budge an inch).

Mohammad Ali (not minding this interruption) : Now, gentlemen of the Jury.

The Court : Do not interrupt the Court.

Mohammad Ali : I am not interrupting the Court. Rather you are interrupting me. I have got to argue regarding this exception. I have got to deal with this. Take away the charges under Sections 505 and 117 against me if you can and I shall stop. You have got the power to amend the charge up to the last.

The Court : I cannot allow you to discuss religious law here.

Mohammad Ali : There is no question of religious law. I am arguing about the law of the land, as you call it. I have got to show to the Assessors that this declaration of statement contained in the resolution is true because it is based on the Quran and the Hadith.

The Court : There is no necessity of it.

Mohammad Ali : It is I who have got to consider the necessity, not you. You had no right to stop the Prosecution witnesses. You could not have stopped them unless you said that their evidence was inadmissible. You did not

stop the public prosecutor. He was to prove what he thought was necessary. But you will not allow me to prove what I think is necessary; to prove that it is a true statement of Muslim law that I laid down, that is haram to serve in the army. I have got to prove that from the Quran and the Hadith, material or immaterial, I have got to do it from the Islamic law, I have got to take my law from the Quran and from the King. The King gives me protection for following the Quran's law in those Proclamations. That is the King's law. If you do not obey that, then why is the King's portrait over there (pointing to the portrait of King. Edward hung upon the wall) I have got to take my law from this King. I have got my statement based on the King's law. I do not want to create a scene. I am not here for that purpose. I have not shown disrespect to you even though I could not show any respect to the Court as part of government. I do not want to be obstinate and cheeky. But I cannot have my right brushed aside.

The Court : But you take so much time.

Mohammad Ali : Yesterday, you sent me word that you will give me half an hour more today to discuss the supremacy of religious law before I come to the legal point and the facts of the case. I have already finished with that. I say that religion was to be an exception in every case. Now, dealing with the law of the land, Section 505, I have got to prove that it is religiously forbidden to serve in the army, that it is a true statement and therefore I come under the exception to Section 505.

The Court : Suppose it is accepted that is a true statement.

Mohammad Ali : Let the Assessors accept it. Let them give it to me that this is considered to be proved ? Tell me that this is proved—that my statement is true. I will go on. Then I will not argue one word more about it. Ask the public prosecutor whether I have got the right or not.

Public Prosecutor : We admit that the passages cited in his statement before the lower Court are in the Quran.

Mohammad Ali : I want you to admit more than that. I want you to admit that this statement for which I am charged under Section 505 is in accordance with the Quran and the Hadith.

Public Prosecutor : We can't admit that.

Mohammad Ali : If you won't admit I have got to prove it. Supposing a Christian is charged for making a statement of his belief in God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. He says that he has got to prove that is the Christian belief and a true statement. He says, 'I will show it from the Bible, I will show it from the Epistles—I will show it from the Gospels—I will show it from the Prayer Book. Will he not be entitled to do that ? Will I, a Muslim, be a fair judge ? Do you think it will be fair of me not to allow him to prove that this is a correct statement of the Christian Trinitarian's faith ?

The Court (nodding his head) : Sit down.

Mohammad Ali : I cannot sit unless you admit that my statement is true.

I should like to say one thing. I really do not want to be obstinate. I do not want to be needlessly importunate, out of sheer cussedness and ill-will against the Court. I do not want to show any disrespect to you. This does not tally with any part of my character as an accused person or as a non-cooperator. But at the same time I want to stand on my right.

The Court : You are wasting the Court's time.

Mohammad Ali : I am not wasting anybody's time. I just want to convince the Jury that the statement is a true statement.

The Court : It matters not.

Mohammad Ali : It matters a great deal to me. It matters much so far as I am concerned. It matters a great deal to prove to the gentlemen of the Jury that this is in accordance with the Quran and Hadith and that I did not fabricate it. I may have made a false statement. Supposing I commit a rape and I come in before the Court and I say that my religion allows it. You can say, 'Show it to me from your religious law.' You will not take my word for it and you will have to allow me to prove it. What is it after all ? I am not asking for protection for a murder that I have committed. I am not asking for protection for arson that I have committed nor am I seeking protection for loot. Loot becomes sacred when the army commander orders it. Murder is no murder when the army commander commands it. In my case, too, when the Quran commands, murder is no murder. So when I referred to the Quran you can say, 'Show it to me.'

The Court : Suppose we admit it for argument's sake.

Mohammad Ali : I want it to be admitted for all purposes. I may not argue one word about the intention. Gentlemen I am not speaking in my defence. But I must prove this was a correct statement. I had the same difficulty with my friend Mr. Montague, who said, 'Far be it from me, Mr. Mahommed Ali, to intervene in a discussion about your religion.' I said to him, 'Please do'. Let us discuss it. And I was actually in tears before him when I told him it is no pleasure to me to be against his government. He respected those tears. I explained the religious law about the Khilafat and the Jazirat-ul-Arab and he had to listen. I had to explain my religion to Mr. Lloyd George also and to some other members of the Cabinet and they had not said they had nothing to do with the Quran.

I want to prove that this is a correct statement and you must not take away my right to prove it. Will you allow it ?

The Court : If you will only do it in a very short way. (The whole house burst into peals of laughter at the Judge's relaxing at long last).

Mohammad Ali (to the Court) : Why did you not say so before ? Of course, I will do it in a short way—in fact in a very short way.

Gentlemen, I do not know whether a man is exempted or not in the army from observing his caste usages. This form includes merely a question about them and we do not know what happens to the intending recruit who wishes to observe them. Dante wrote in his *Inferno* and Milton quotes it in

his *Paradise Lost* also, that this legend is inscribed over the gate of Hell : 'Whosoever enters here must leave all hope behind.' So it should be written over the portals of the British Indian Army : 'Whosoever enters this must leave all faith behind.' On a famous occasion the German Chancellor had said : 'Necessity knows no law' and those who execrate this lawless doctrine are being punished as law-breakers. What we want is that government should be straightforward and honest. At present people go to the army apparently with their eyes shut. We ask that they join the army knowing very well that their religious law and its obligations on them will not be respected, but would be sacrificed to the Moloch of military exigencies and that one Queen's Proclamation and two Kings' Proclamations will afford them no protection, nobody will then blame the government. All the sin would be those people's who knew all this and yet joined the army. But what is it after all that Islamic law demands to-day ? For what offence does it seek the secular law's protection ? Not for human sacrifice ! I do not say, 'Shoot your officers—kill them.' No, on the contrary, I demand that they be not guilty of the human sacrifice of their Muslim brothers—of fratricide. When you took them to fight the Germans on the outbreak of the War, I did not say, 'Do not fight with them.' I do not say, if there is disorder in Karachi and Muslims are rioting that Muslim soldiers should not go and stop that. In this form (showing the form of enlistment) all sorts of questions are asked. The form says, 'the following nine questions' but there are really fourteen and not nine questions in all (reads all the questions). I do not know what happens if he says he is unwilling to be vaccinated or even to be revaccinated—as some Hindus may well do on account of the vaccine or lymph from the cow. The solemn declaration of the intending recruit only says that the answers are true and that he is willing to fulfil the engagements made without explaining what they are. But let us presume that he has expressed his willingness to be vaccinated and to go wherever ordered by land or sea and allow no caste usage to interfere with his military duty and that these are the engagements. But whereas the fifteenth question, which should have been : 'Are you willing to do anything you are ordered and allow no religious commandment to interfere with your military duty ? Are you willing to forgo your religion ?' Where is such a question in the form ? If the man says, 'Yes,' then it is all right, and if he refuses, you can chuck him out. But you don't ask him this question, you dare not do that—seducing from duty. As I have already said, we are teaching him his first duty—that his first duty is to God and the second duty is to his country and his king. Gentlemen of the Jury, the Proclamation came, as you know, after the greased cartridges affair and the Mutiny, and it was to repudiate precisely this unlimited connotation of military duty that it was issued in 1858. But what is the tearing with one's teeth of greased cartridges or eating a whole pig compared to the sin of killing a Muslim ? I have already stated in my statement in the lower Court and I repeat it that if a man is threatened with death unless he consents to take pork, he may not only take it but must and if he is killed

on account of refusal to do so, he dies a sinner. In like circumstances he may even declare that he is a Kafir if he continues to be a believer, at heart, though it is preferable not to do so, and if he is killed on account of refusal, he dies a martyr. But, in like circumstances, he must not kill or dismember another Muslim but patiently submit to be killed instead. And you dare not ask a Muslim to touch cartridges with pigs' grease as part of military duty since your experience of 1857 and the Proclamation of 1858 and yet you call it part of military duty to kill Muslims which is far worse than eating pork and worse even than outward apostasy. The absence of such a question as I have suggested means that the government understood what it would lead to. We consider it a part of duty therefore to remind the Muslim soldier of his duty to God, to demand from a Muslim that he must carry out his God's law. That is not seducing him from doing his duty in the army and, in any case, he need not desert or fail in his duty but appeal to Government through his superior officers that such duty as is against his religion may not be required of him. There is, therefore, neither a likelihood nor an intention of seducing a soldier from his duty as such.

Gentlemen of the Jury, I am not anxious to get off. I am not anxious for my defence. I make no defence whatsover, though I had to explain the law of Islam to you and explain the bearing of that on the position we have taken up. I have not cross-examined witnesses nor produced evidence on my own side. But I want you, who are mostly my countrymen, though co-operating with this government, to consider this. You will find that in the history of the world many celebrated trials have taken place and many great people have been declared guilty of many offences. In English history itself even poor Joan of Arc was killed for a witch. But with what result ? Her golden statue stood before my hotel in France and while I was there the Catholic Church led by the Pope and the College of Cardinals canonised her, and what did the successors of those who had burnt her do. Why, the British army joined the French in honouring her memory and in placing wreaths on her statue. I was present at such a scene. George Washington was a wicked rebel in the time of George III. What is the verdict of the British Government today ? He is the greatest patriot.

I should like to address a remark or two particularly to the solitary Englishman on the Jury. Englishmen are not bound to follow the majority of their countrymen, particularly in unrighteousness and injustice. Believe me, throughout English history it has been the minority that was mostly in the right, and at any rate it was the minority that began great and good movements. A great cause had never been started in the world's history by the majority. It was not Pilate that was crucified. It was Christ (God's peace and blessings be on him). Pilate was the Judge who pronounced the verdict against Christ. But who pronounces the verdict now and who will pronounce it hereafter ? On the last day—the Day of Judgment, it is God who will pronounce the sentence on Pilate who did not know what was truth, and ask

that famous or infamous question so cynically. But where is Pilate now ? Who ever remembers him—the great crucifying Judge, except for Christ's crucification ? Now, to millions of human beings Christ is the Saviour. But who am I, an humble individual, to compare myself with Christ, I who am not worthy even to take the dust off the feet of Christ. But as the poet has said :

Weakness never need be falseness,
Truth is Truth in each degree,
Thunder pealed by God to Nature,
Whispered by my soul to me.

And in the thunder peals of British howitzers the still small voice of an humble man's soul has whispered into his ear this little bit of truth—God's eternal, everlasting soul sustaining Truth—that he must not stand by and see Muslims in spite of God's clear law, but must preach against it and propagate God's Truth unshaken by fear of man and untroubled by mundane consequences.

Gentlemen, take another case—the case of the martyrs of Karbala. The Prophet's grandson had only seventy-two men and Yazid's army had thousands and they killed him. He was then in a small minority. But for thirteen hundred years the mourning for that vile deed—the deed of the government in power—has been going on. Every Muslim mourns for Husain-Husain the victim, and not for Yazid the proud victor, and many Muslim cities have a quarter just outside known as Karbala, while not a trace of Yazid's grave can be found anywhere. So, gentlemen, do not think of the consequences of your verdict today or to-morrow, but of its ultimate consequences here to human freedom and hereafter, in another world. And you have got to judge for yourself. Ralli Brothers cannot judge for you. Forbes, Forbes and Campbell who objected to a small white Gandhi cap cannot judge for you. Mr. Lloyd George about his soul, not about yours, and he may have much to answer for. God will ask you about your individual soul and none of others. And if as a Hindu you believe only in punishment in this very world through the cycle of transmigration of souls, you must remember that, according to your belief God's judgment will be visited upon here and not hereafter and you will be judged the moment your soul quits its abode in your body and seeks another. Whatever your creed, your Karma is your own, the final judgment does not rest with you any more than with the Judge there but with God, the Lord of all the worlds.

Gentlemen, I have taken much of your time, for more than I had intended to take or would have taken were it not for being constantly interrupted and stopped. But, as I said at the very outset, had it been a case of my individual defence or of all of us accused together only, I would not have argued at such length and with such persistence. I do not seek to avoid punishment for the jail is the gateway to India's freedom. Had I sought to avoid the entire prosecution and to prove my case according to the canons of this very law, the

so-called law of the land, I could have cross-examined the witnesses and torn their evidence to shreds. I was really tempted to do that in the case of Col. Gwyer with his enlistment forms and his 'soldier's duty as such'. I think I may say this though I do not pretend to be a big lawyer like my friend the public prosecutor or his little assistant. Nevertheless, the case is so hopelessly weak that it could not keep us shut up in the jail for a day even if the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England himself, better known as Rufus Isaacs, K.C., had his government's brief. But although a non-cooperator and therefore debarred from my duty as such to defend myself I had to speak up when the Viceroy indulged in his hill-top obiter dicta on a matter which he knew and admitted was sub-judice. He said that this was no case of an attack on Islam or religious interference. What could be a more flagrant case of both ?

If the tallest poppies are to be cut off for unfolding Islam and its laws and you ask those who remain what is your opinion about the law of Islam, which only means your turn next if you dare to tell the truth and you cut off their heads too if they still dare, the result may well be that there will be none to stand up and oppose your will. And then you will say, 'We interfere not with your faiths.' If this is non-interference, you can enjoy the self-complacence induced by such boasts of toleration. But that is not all. We are asked to look at him—the tallest poppy of the Israelite garden in England—as upon a certificate of British toleration. But, gentlemen, I cannot imitate the ex-Lord Chief Justice of England and Viceroy of India. His law is a law unto him and my law is a law unto me. The example of his people, if I may say so without offence, is constantly mentioned in the Quran for the Muslim to avoid and take heed from. According to the Quran, after Moses (on whom be God's peace and blessing) and brought the Israelites safely out of Egypt and they had been delivered from the tyranny of Pharaoh, they were asked to march on to the Promised Land. But they said, 'It is ruled by giants, we shall never be able to enter it so long as they are there', and they said to Moses, 'Go thou and thy God, and fight them—we are thou while sitting here.'

Well, gentlemen, that's not an example that I am asked to follow in the case of my holy land. So far as I am concerned, the Quran is my law, giants or no giants, and I shall fight when my God demands it of me and shall not rest, nor ask Him to fight the giants Himself. And if I am to be hanged for it—for it is not section 120 (A) or (B) then, but 121, waging War against the King, gentlemen, I will still say that this is my law and that it is right and even my carcass hanging from the gibbet, will say the same ! Do not therefore think of saving me, gentlemen, from transportation for life. But if you have a God and if you have a soul to save and you have faith, you will decide according to your conscience. You are not to consider whether you are servant of a particular company of the Greek firm of Ralli Brothers—or Forbes, Forbes and Campbell—of nothing of that, but only of this that you are slaves and servivors of God. Gentlemen, this is the one important matter. So just according to your conscience it is not to save me but to save yourselves. When the Judge had

said, 'I cannot allow this', and wanted to stop me, I said to him—then why not stop this farce and hang me outright'. Well, he smiled and replied that it was only a matter between him and me, but also between him and the public and I had replied that the public had already given their verdict within this hall and also in the streets where they crowded in their thousands and cheer us going and coming and the old women in spite of their Purdah come out—as my own mother had done since this trial and make signs to us indicating that they want to take off our troubles. Well, gentlemen, my defence is before my God and my fellow countrymen. Here we are now at the bar of this Court as prisoners and accused persons. But when before the judgement—seat of God, the judge, the jury, the accused, all the co-accused, the public prosecutor and his assistant, the King himself—every-body is assembled and God asks, 'Whose is the dominion to-day'—what will be your answer ? You will say, 'Thine Kingdom Thine the Dominion.' You pray now, 'May thy Kingdom come !' But, gentlemen, His Kingdom has come. God's Kingdom is here even today. It is not the kingdom of King George, but God's and you must decide on that basis and I must act on that assumption. That is why I say I will follow the law of King George so long as he does not force me to go against him, I have none even against t!.. Judge here, nor against the Government. Not a single instance of that can be quoted from my public speeches. No, gentlemen, we must act from motives of public good, not of private malice. Once the Prophet's son-in-law, cousin and successors, Hazrat Ali was enraged against a Jew who had insulated Islam and the God of Islam and the faith of Islam, and Ali had jumped on top of him. The Jew thought that he was going to be killed and in sheer desperation spat on Ali's face. You have seen, have you not, a vessel full of milk on the fire and about to boil over, and you have seen how it subsides the moment a little cold water is poured in. The Jew's spitting acted just in that manner and strangely enough, the wrath of Ali subsided at once and he left the Jew and walked away. But the Jew was so astonished at this unexpected turn of events that he ran after, Ali and caught hold of him and said, 'This is very strange. When I said a word you forced me down and would have kilied me, and when I spat on your face in desperation, you leave me !' And, Ali answered : 'You insul d God and I could have killed you, but when you spat on me I got enraged on my own account, and personal ill-will could not go well with public duty. I could be an executioner for the sake of God but not a murderer for Ali.' Gentlemen, we two bear the revered name of Ali and I have also the name of another, even greater than Ali. I will not be a party to the killing even of a gnat for personal malice but for the sake of my God I will kill all. I will not spare anyone—I will slaughter my own brother, my dear aged mother, wife, children and all for the sake of God, so help me God ! (And as he said this his voice failed him, drops of tears rolled down his cheeks and he sat down completely overcome).

Source : K. L. Gauba, *Famous and Historic Trials*, Lahore, 1946.

50

'SWARAJ' DEFINED

Lucknow, 5 June 1922

A joint meeting of the Working Committee of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and Khilafat was held at the house of the late Maulvi Mumtaz Husain, Barrister on the 5th June at 7 a.m. The following attended : Maulvi Kifayatullah of Delhi, President, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abdul Qadir of Badaun, Dr. Ansari, Maulana Abdul Majid of Badaun, Maulana Suleiman Nadvi, Maulana Mazharuddin Bijnauri, Moazzam Ali Bar-at-law, Maulana Ismail Khan of Meerut, Maulana Azad Subhani of Cawnpore, Maulana Nurul Hasan, Zaheer Ahmad.

The discussion to fix the meaning of the term Swaraj was opened by Maulana Abdul Majid. Maulana Abdul Qadir said that it ought to be defined to mean complete independence. A resolution was drafted :

'The joint meeting of the Working Committees of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and the Khilafat expresses its opinion about the question of Swaraj that in view of the real benefit and in obedience to the opinion of the country and nation it is essential that it should be defined in one manner only, *i.e.* by complete independence, and recommends to the Indian National Congress to consider it in this light and to fix complete independence as the real meaning of Swaraj as soon as possible.'

Maulvi Kifayatullah said that the rejection of the proposal of 'Complete Independence' had disheartened and disappointed the Mussulmans. If it is accepted it would remove that feeling but if the Congress will reject it, the Mussulmans will in a body demand it.

Source : Home Dept. Pol. 1922, F. No. 868.

51

SPEECH OF BI AMMAN, MOTHER OF ALI BROTHERS AND THE QUESTION OF PROSECUTING HER

Lahore, 29 August 1922

Bi Amman, the mother of Maulana Mahommed Ali, arrived in Lahore on August 27, and was received at the station by a few Khilafatists. The wife of Maulana Mahommed Ali and Maulvi Zahid Ali were in her company. There

was no procession. The visitors were conducted to the office of the Women's Khilafat Committee where they were interviewed by many ladies.

A mass meeting was held in the evening in the gardens outside Mochi Gate. Malak Lal Khan presided. Bi Amman made a very spirited and inflammatory speech in which she held that Indians had committed two follies during the past 150 years. Firstly, she said, they had sided with the British and brought about the capture of their own king and, secondly, they helped them during the Indian Mutiny. If Indians had not done so there was no possibility of these 'merchants' getting supremacy in India, and shackling Indians in fetters of serfdom. 'Would they', she continued, 'commit another folly and put her, their aged mother, to shame.'

Proceeding further she drew a picture of India in which she could see nothing but abject poverty and could hear nothing but the moans of departing humanity. She asked whether her audience ever read of such a state in the past history of their fatherland. She held that 'the exploiting traders' had devastated India. Having known the double dealings of these 'traders', Indians, she continued, should shake off drowsiness and wake up to pursue their own good. They should break their bonds and prepare themselves to wend their way to jails and even to receive bullets. For herself she was prepared to go to gaol or to be shot dead. 'Be men', she added, 'and carry out the determination you have formed.'

She dilated on the boycott of Councils, Khaddar, and Hindu-Muslim unity and advised the establishment of Panchayats throughout India.

Sikhs did not escape her notice. She referred to what she described as their many spirit and feminine tenderness. She held them to be the embodiment of courage. She praised their mattle for the courage they were displaying in their present trial. 'The English may arrest you or shoot you down but you should not be disheartened', she said. Her earnest prayer was that God might inspire Hindus and Mussulmans with the motives and earnestness of Sikhs. She desired that they should not lose themselves while acting enthusiastically on the principles which commanded their confidence. Should they keep to this rule final victory was theirs. Thirty three crores of human beings could not possibly be afraid of our lakhs of pissus.

She concluded with the following appeal :

'Brethren, fear not jails, fear not bullets. Death is inevitable whether it comes through bullets or disease. We will be martyrs if we die by bullets and if spared we will be soldiers of God. Victory will be ours here and hereafter. May God save my honour and may He work your and your children's salvation.'

The wife of Maulana Mahommed Ali and Maulvi Zahid Ali followed and dwelt upon Hindu-Muslim unity and items of non-cooperation.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, F. No. 933, 1922.

52

LETTER FROM O'DONALL, TO H. D. CRAIK
Simla, 1 September 1922

I am desired to invite attention to the speech delivered on August 29 by Bi Amman, mother of Mahommed Ali, at Lahore. The Government of India would be glad to be informed whether this speech and other speeches of this woman are having any real effect, since if they are producing a serious effect, it appears to them that it will be necessary to prosecute irrespective of her sex and age or prohibit her from speaking.

Source : Government of India, Home Department, F. No. 933, 1922.

53

SIR ABBAS ALI BAIG ON TURKISH QUESTION

'......the heroic struggle of resourceless Turkish nationalists in the defence of their homelands and their right to national freedom, and the outraged feeling of the Muslim world, have opened the eyes of the British nation to the trend of the forces which must be taken into account in bringing about an equitable settlement in the Near and Middle East.

'.......At the outset of the War with Turkey Lord Hardinge was authorized to issue in the name of the British nation a proclamation declaring that the war was purely secular and that there would be no interference whatever with the Holy Places of Islam.... After these declarations came the famous pledge of the Prime Minister in January 1918, that 'the rich and renowned' homelands of the Turks in Anatolia and Thrace, which he emphatically declared were 'predominently Turkish in race', with Constantinople as the capital of the Ottoman Empire, would remain under Turkish sovereignty.... The pledge was reaffirmed with greater emphasis in February 1920, in a memorable speech, in the course of which he said 'without their (Indian Muslims) aid we should not have conquered Turkey at all.' Were we to have broken faith with them in the hour of victory ? We might go to them and say : 'The circumstances have changed......'

'The promise of non-interference with the Holy Places of Islam was set aside by the complete removal of the Khalifa's wardenship, which, as Mr.

Ameer Ali has pointed out, is essential under 'the Muslim eclessiastical law for the valid performance of the rites associated with the Haj.'

'In his manifesto the Viceroy 'particularly' urges three main points, which the British Cabinet has already prejudged as extravagant before the Paris Conference has had an opportunity of discussing them with an unbiased mind. The Muslim claims, however, have a wider range within the limits of the declaration of the Allies and may briefly be summarized as under :

1. The restoration of Asia Minor to Turkish sovereignty.
2. Restoration of the whole of Thrace to Ottoman rule, unless an uninfluenced plebiscite shows that the majority of the population prefer some other form of government.
3. The evacuation of Constantinople, unfettered by any conditions calculated to render the military and naval defence of the capital of the Ottoman Empire ineffective against hostile aggression.
4. The recognition and restoration of the Khalifa's wardenship of the Holy Places of Islam.
5. The recognition of the right of the Muslim majorities in those regions which were under Ottoman sovereignty before the War to self-determination or such form of government as they may choose.

'The Muslim view is that these demands do not go beyond the obvious implications of the British word or exceed what is considered just and equitable in the case of Christian races. As the Viceroy has pointed out, the Muslim cause has received the support of all Indians. The allegation that the Muslims of India are 'dictating' to the British government any policy is unwarranted. In the words of Mr. Montague, as 'Turkey was beaten in the main by Indian soldiers India is entitled to a predominant voice' in the consideration of the Muslim demands which affect only the dismembered territories of the Ottoman Empire inhabited by Mahommedan races, and not any questions involving the higher interests of the British Empire.'

Source : The Asiatic Review, April 192.

54

NINTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE

Gaya, 27 December 1922

SUMMARY OF THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Dr. M.A. Ansari said that the response of the people to the Khilafat movement since its inauguration was satisfactory and the movement had now become a patent factor to be reckoned with in the settlement of the world problems concerning Islam. The attitude of Government of India and the British public towards the Khilafat question had only recently changed in favour of the Turks, but he regretted to find that the British Cabinet was still unfriendly as was proved by the retention of Lord Curzon as Foreign Secretary, and that Mr. Bonar Law had not explained the Near Eastern policy and had not pledged restoration of Palestine and Mesopotamia despite favourable British opinion regarding it. He invited the audience to compare the change in the mentality of the British Foreign Office compare the Turks from pride and prejudice to simulation and cajolery brought about by the growing power of the Kemalists. Yusuf's mission of peace on the occasion of the sitting of the Paris Conference had failed. Angora's request for joining the Geneva Conference was summarily rejected and Fathi Bey's mission to London to make the best attempt to secure peace by peaceful means safeguarding the rights of the minorities met with scant courtesy at the hands of the British Government which compared unfavourably with the enthusiasm and goodwill of M. Poincare. He felt gratified that the fiery statement issued by the British Government sending a fiery cross round the Dominions and Balkans met with the strong disapproval of the British public and that Mr. Lloyd George's dismissal from office was the only possible answer which a war-weary nation could give to the ex-premier's sabre-rattling. He contrasted the attitude of Great Britain with that of France and Italy and declared that Britain owed the fall of its prestige to the mistakes of its own government.

THE MUDANIA INTRIGUE

He then dwelt with what he termed the intrigues at the Mudania Conference to deprive Kemalists of the just fruits of their great victory and the filibustering attitude of General Harrington which failed to frighten the Turks. He praised the spirit of patience and fair-mindedness shown by Turks in accepting Armistice terms inspite of their being victors and in the face of grave provocations. He termed as lie the propaganda attributing atrocities to Turks, especially the burning of Smyrna, and quoted official statements of the American Relief Committee and the result of enquiry by French officials in

Smyrna and Constantinople to prove that the charge lay rather on the door of the Greeks and Armenians.

LAUSANNE CONFERENCE

Referring to the Lausanne Conference the speaker greatly deplored the inability of M. Franklin Bouillon to represent France owing to continued violent and evidently inspired campaign in the English Press against him and his policy. Lord Curzon with his well-known anti-Turkish tendencies was comminating the Allies and therefore it would be too much to expect the Conference to be swayed only by considerations of reason and justice. Muslim demands, the speaker observed, were too well-known to require any repetition. He however, uttered a warning that Mussulmans would not rest unless in addition to a satisfactory settlement of the Turkish question the entire Jazirarat-ul-Arab was completely free from non-Muslim control and the Khalifa's wardenship of Holy Places was restored.

THE EX-SULTAN

Dealing with the fight of the ex-Sultan Khalifa, Dr. Ansari described how Wahiuddin Effendi had been sacrificing since the Armistice the interest of his country and religion on sheer selfishness. He had coerced his Ministers into signing the iniquitous Treaty of Sevres and would have complacently confirmed the doom of his country and religion had not the Nationalists fled and established themselves in Angora, thereby placing the ratification of the treaty out of his reach. He had done all this for self-interest at the instance of the Allies, for he had been too weak to oppose them. Even then the Kemalists had no intention of deposing him and had to do so only when he attempted to weaken the Turkish cause at Lausanne by deciding to send another delegation from Constantinople. For his misfortunes he had to thank himself and, so far as the Mussulmans of the world were concerned, his objectionable deeds were an open book to them and they did not feel sorry for him at all. The Ex-Shaikhul Islam who had declared Mustafa Kemal the saviour of Islam and Turkey as a renegade and in conjunction with whom the Ex-Sultan would have had Mustafa Kemal punished with the help of the so-called Khilafat army, had also taken refuge with others in the hospitable British embassy and then in Malta. These peoples, said the speaker, would be utilized by interested propagandists to alienate Muslim sympathies from the Kemalists, but they all know too well about the bonafides of these persons and their sponsors to be deceived by them.

TEMPORAL POWER QUESTION

Speaking about the accession of Sultan Abdul Majid Khan and the Sultan Khalifa, the speaker observed with satisfaction that the old practice chosing the Sultan Khalifa only on account of his intrinsic merits was restored. Referring to capital that had been ingeniously sought to be made out of the new

Angora constitution by representing it as having separated the Sultanate from Khilafat, Dr. Ansari remarked at the outset that the news had been sent from quarters intensely interested in discrediting Kemalists. Many sensational untruths inspired from these quarters had been inflicted on them but little reliance could be put in their version of the constitution which, it was significant, had always been only vague and never sent out in full. Obedience to religious injunctions by the Kemalists, as shown by their prohibition laws etc., was a guarantee that they would not go against the religious commandments. News coming from uninterested quarters, however vague, showed that the Angora constitution aimed only at making the Sultan a constitutional monarch. Although the full details of the constitution were not in their possession, yet the speaker had no doubt in his own mind that constitutional sovereignty was nearer the fact than vaticanisation of the Khalifa as given out by interested sources. The law of Islam also sanctioned the relegation of authority to ministers by the Sultan Khalifa and a constitutional monarch was therefore strictly in accordance with the Shariat. Lord Curzon, on supposition that the constitution militated against Islamic laws, had tauntingly asked the Mussulmans what they would do. The Mussulmans believed the Kemalists completely loyal to religion, and they did not treat this kind of propaganda against the Kemalists seriously, but the speaker assured Lord Curzon on behalf of the Indian Mussulmans, that if ever such a thing as separating the Sultanate from the Khilafat happened the Mussulmans would remember their duty without a clue from him. If Turks made a mistake the Mussulmans would do all to get it rectified but not with his lordships aid. His anti-Turkish attempts at creating a division was foredoomed to failure, because the common misfortune had brought about a wonderful solidarity among Muslims all over the world. There was not a Muslim country or colony that had not shown its active sympathy for the Turks in one way or the other, and not been heartily pleased at the great success of the Kemalists. The universal rejoicings all the world over at the Kemalists victories should act, Dr. Ansari advised, as a sufficient object lesson to those who fondly dream of division.

CONGRESS PROGRAMME

Discussing future programme of work, Dr. Ansari urged pushing forward the constructive programme not as an end in itself but as a sure step for preparing the country to win the triple goal. He appealed to the Mussulmans to concentrate their efforts in raising ten lakhs of rupees for the Khilafat fund, ten lakhs of Khilafat members, and enlisting one lakh of volunteers within the next four months.

Dealing with national education he dwelt on the foremost position of the national Muslim University of Aligarh as a seat of future Muslim culture, in free and united India. In course of two brief years though neglected to a large extent and working against tremendous odds it had already shown a record of work which any insitution might justly be pround of. One need of the uni-

versity was to secure immediate financial stability and he appealed for rupees ten lakhs for the national Muslim University. He also suggested at least Rs. 20 per month to be given to the national Muslim University by every District Khilafat Committee, or a sum by every Provincial Khilafat Committee, corresponding to the number of districts in each province. Dr. Ansari recommended that in the interest of the Swadeshi movement picketing of foreign cloth shops should be started in at least all big centres.

Coming to the question of Councils, the speaker emphasised the futility of contesting seats. He advocated an alternative scheme of setting up parallel polling booths during council elections, where voters sympathising with the Congress should be invited to record their votes. He described how this scheme would prove more advantageous, less costly yet more effective in boycotting the Councils.

INDIAN NATIONAL PACT

Emphasising absolute necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity the speaker declared his conviction that the formation of a homogenous and United Indian nation on the founding of such unity was the essential pre-requisite for attaining Swarajya, and more than that for retaining it. He believed that real and lasting unity was impossible unless Hindus and Mussulmans decided to adjust their differences in a spirit, liberal and yet absolutely frank and in a just manner. To achieve that consummation he suggested drawing up of an Indian National Pact.

It should define Swaraj and have provisions made for safeguarding the rights of different communities especially of the minorities fixing up proportion of representation, of the various communities, the small minorities to get representations in excess of their populations—these to be given from Hindu and Muslim members. It should secure perfect freedom in religious observances of various communities and sects inhabiting India and complete respect for their religious observances and susceptibilities. It should also provide for settlement of questions leading to differences and conflicts, e.g., cow killing, Daserah, Moharram and other processions, music before mosques, and shrines etc., under the terms of the pact. Arbitration boards should be appointed in each province and district for preventing communal frictions, and arbitration in cases of disputes proposed by the pact should be ratified by bodies representing the peoples, communities and sects of India (e.g. the Indian National Congress, Hindu Maha Sabha, Central Khilafat Committee and Jamait-ul-Ulema etc.) together with a solemn declaration from these bodies in case of an invasion for the conquest of India by a foreign power. All the communities and sects inhabiting India would unite to resist such an invasion of the sacred soil of their motherland.

PAN-ASIATIC MOVEMENT

Dr. Ansari next referred to the need of a pan-Asiatic movement to bring

about the solidarity among the peoples and countries of Asia with a view to rescuing them from the political and economic bondage of Europe. He suggested that missions should be sent on behalf of India to establish friendly relation with peoples of different Asiatic countries and mission elected by the representative institutions of the people (not necessarily governments of these countries) should be invited to send their own missions to India for the same purpose. The agencies representing the peoples of India should be established in those countries which in their turn should have agencies representing their nations in India and other countries. The plenary session of the Asiatic Federation might be held at a suitable place, preferrably in India, at the time of the annual sessions of the Indian National Congress. He then detailed the advantages that would accrue from this Asiatic Federation to India and the different communities comprising the Indian nation and appealed to the country to give a lead in the matter. In conclusion he appealed to the Mussulmans and the other peoples of India for the speedy completion of the Angora Aeroplane fund.

[Here the President had to conclude his address as it was about 1 p.m. when the National Congress was to resume its sitting adjourned the day before.]

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1923.

55

AMEER ALI ON THE CALIPHATE AND THE ISLAMIC RENAISSANCE

The recent election of a new Caliph as the religious head of the vast millions who belong to the Sunni communion of Islam has stimulated widespread interest in the history and significance of this unique dignity. The followers of Islam constitute an immense population stretching from the western coast of Africa to the eastern most part of China, from the Khirgiz steppes of Central Asia to the Malayan archipelago. All are animated by one common sentiment of unity of faith and doctrine. Even the long-standing feud between Sunni and Shiah has now disappeared as a factor in practical politics. But the Sunnis form by far the largest section of the Islamic population. Taking 300 millions as a moderate estimate of the followers of Islam among the world's inhabitants (the Muslims themselves place the figure

considerably higher) some 270 millions profess the Sunni doctrine. The Shia barely exceed thirty millions, of whom about twelve millions inhabit Persia, the principal Shiah State; some ten millions dwell in India; the rest live dispersed in various Asiatic countries and North Africa. The Sunni population extends in a solid mass from the shores of the Atlantic to the confines of China, with Persia only to interrupt the continuity of the chain. The land of Confucius is reported to contain some thirty-five millions of Muslims, all of whom belong to the Sunni communion, and all of whom look to constantinople as the seat of their religious head. The chief causes which led to this startling disparity in the numbers of the two sects need not be discussed here.

Among the moral forces which govern the lives and conduct of human beings the mystical element is one of the strongest. Both Sunnis and Shiahs recognise the strength of this mystical element in their religious conceptions; both believe that the spiritual leadership of Islam (the Imamate) is the nexus which links the Founder of the Faith with his followers. But they differ in their conception of the right to the Imamate. The Shiahs believe in divine appointment; they hold that the spiritual leadership belongs exclusively to the House of Mahommed; that it descended in the direct line of his rightful successors until it came to the 12th Imam, who disappeared in a cavern in Mesopotamia in the year 878 A.D. They believe that he is alive and will reappear towards the end of the world to redeem mankind from sin and sorrow. He is therefore called the Ghaib (the 'absent'), the Mahdi (the 'guide') and the Muntazzar (the 'awaited'). He is believed to be always present in spirit at the devotions of his fold. The exponders of law and the ministers of religion are his representatives on earth; and the temporal chiefs are his delegates in the secular affairs of the world.* The Shiahs also believe that the Imam must be sinless or immaculate, and 'the most excellent of mankind'.

The conception of the Sunnis is quite different. They believe the promised Guide is not yet born, and for that reason it is essential under the sacred law to have a Vice-gerent (Khalifa) of the Prophet elected to that office by the voice of the people. To the Sunnis the vox populi is the vox dei. According to their doctrines, among the qualifications necessary for occupying the pontifical throne, the first and most essential is that the Caliph should be a Moslem and should belong to the Sunni persuation. He must also be a man of good character, possessed of the capacity to transact affairs of State and competent to lead the prayers. The Sunnis further insist that the Caliph should be an independent ruler, not subject to a foreign Power. His responsibility for the

* I am speaking here of the principal Shiah sect, the followers of the twelve Imams. A group of Shiahs succeeded in building up in the 10th century a rival Caliphate in North Africa and founded esoteric centres for the diffusion of their peculiar cult. The representatives of this sect are now to be found in fragments in different parts of Asia and Africa. One of their centres was the 'Eagle's Nest' whence the 'Old Man of the Mountain' waged relentless war against Sunni orthodoxy and society in general through his devoted disciples and emissaries.

proper use of the powers vested in him is necessarily associated with his office and dignity.

There is little or no analogy between the Pontiff of the Church of Rome and the Caliph of Sunni Islam. The Caliph's temporal powers involve certain duties, e.g., the defence of the Empire, administration of the State, questions of peace and war, foreign relations. But all these can be entrusted to 'deputies,' to a Council, or, in the language of modern Europe, to a Parliament. If the Caliph transgresses the laws he runs the risk of being deposed by the constituted law officers. The Sunni religious law insists that the Imam must be actually present in person to impart religious efficacy to the devotion of the Faithful; and that, where it is not possible for him personally to lead the prayers, he should be represented by properly qualified persons.

These doctrines are enunciated in detail in most works on jurisprudence and scholastic theology. The Khilafat, it is explained, is the Vice-gerency of the Prophet; it is ordained by Divine Law for the perpetuation of Islam and continued observance of its ordinances and rules. For the existence of Islam, therefore, there must always be a Caliph, and actual and direct representative of the Master. The Imamate is the spiritual leadership; but the two dignities are inseparable, for as the Vice-gerent of the Prophet, the Caliph is the only person entitled to lead the prayers that is, when he can himself be present. No one else can assume his functions unless directly or indirectly 'deputed' by him. Between the Imam and the congregation there is a spiritual tie which binds the one to the other in fealty to the Faith. There is no inconsistency between this dogma and the rule that there is no priesthood in Islam. Each man pleads for himself before his Lord, and each soul holds communion with God without the intermediation of any other human being. The Imam forms only the link between the individual worshipper and the evangel of Islam.

The early doctors, on the authority of a reported saying of the Prophet, included another condition among the qualities necessary for the Imamate, namely, that the Caliph-Imam should be a Koreish by birth. Ibn Khaldun's explanation shows the exact meaning of the Prophets saying. At the time the Islamic dispensation was given to the world, a qualified and capable ruler of the Faithful could only be found among the Koreish who were the most advanced and powerful of the tribes of Arabia. And the Prophet therefore recommended that the Caliph and Imam should be chosen from among them. This view is now universally accepted by Moslem scholars and divines.

Under the first four Caliphs, secular and religious affairs were conducted by the Caliph, assisted by a Council of Elders consisting of the principal Companions of the Prophet (the *Sahaba*). The tribal chiefs and ordinary citizens often attended the sittings in the Mosque. Under the Ommeyyades, who held the Caliphate from 661 to 757 A.D., the semblance of a Council was maintained; but in reality the holder of the dignity was a despotic monarch controlled to some extent by the expounders of the law. Under the Abbasides, the rule enunciated by the Prophet that every-thing connected with the

commonwealth should be transacted in consultation with the people, was more strictly observed. Under the later Abbasides, however, the direction of temporal matters passed gradually into the hands of 'delegates' of the Caliph who always, in theory at least, had a Council to assist in their decisions.

On the death of Mohammed, Abu Bakr, who by virtue of his age and the position he had held at Mecca occupied a high place in the estimation of the Arabs, was elected as the Vice-gerent of the Prophet. He was recognised as a man of wisdom and moderation, and his election was accepted by the Prophet's family. After the multitude had taken the oath of fealty to him the newly elected head of the Commonwealth of Islam said :

'Behold me charged with the cares of government. I am not the best among you; I need all your advice and all your help. If I do well, support me; if I mistake, counsel me. To tell truth to a person commissioned to rule is faithful allegiance; to conceal it is treason. In my sight, the powerful and the weak are alike; and to both I wish to render justice. As I obey God and His Prophet, obey me; if I neglect the laws of God and the Prophet, I have no more right to your obedience.'

Abu Bakr died in 634 A. D., and was succeeded by the great Omar. The same procedure of election was followed in his case. Omar in his first pontifical address is reported to have said —

'My brethren, I owe you several duties and you have several rights over me. One of them is that you should see that I do not misuse the income of the State, that I do not adopt wrong measures in the assessment of the dues to the State; that I should protect the frontiers; that I should not involve you in unnecessary wars. Whenever I err, you have a right to stop me and take me to task.'

How many modern statesmen may not take a lesson from the words of this wise ruler ?

This was the Caliph who received, soon after his accession, the capitulation of Jerusalem. Sophrenius, the patriarch who was defending the city, refused to surrender the place to any but the Caliph himself. Omar acceded to the request and travelling with a single attendant, without escort and without any pomp or ceremony, arrived at Jabia, where he was met by a deputation from Jerusalem. To them he accorded the free exercise of their religion, and the possession of their churches and their property, subject to a light tax. He then proceeded with the deputation towards Jerusalem. On the capitulation of the city he granted to the inhabitants similar immunities.

Omar was succeeded first by Osman and then by Ali. Both were elected, as their predecessors had been. It is for this reason that the first four Caliphs of the Sunnis bear the designation of 'the true Caliphs', since they fulfilled in their persons the Sunni ideal of elevation to the office by the suffrage of the people. With the assassination of Ali, the democratic rule came to an end. Of this first republic of Islam, a philosophical French scholar says —

'Thus vanished the popular regime, which had for its basis a patriarchal simplicity, never again to appear among any Mussulman nation; only the jurisprudence and the rules which depended on the Quran survived the fall of the elective government. Some of the republican passion, however, which gave to the small states a certain grandeur, and to the great an excess of force maintained itself in the nation in spite of the armies of the usurpers.

On the assassination of Ali, the Caliphate was seized by Muawiyah of the House of Ommeyya (an offshoot of the Koreish), who converted it into an hereditary sovereign office. Thus began the Ommeyyade dynasty. On the death of Muawiyah's grandson, the Caliphate passed into another branch of the same family, which produced some great rulers. North Africa and Spain were conquered in the reign of the sixth Caliph belonging to this dynasty. The eighth, Omar bin Abdul Aziz, has been deservedly called 'the Marcus Aurelius of the Arabs'. But with his exception the Ommeyyades were absolute monarchs. Although the form of election maintained, the succession was in fact governed by the nomination of the preceding Caliph. The Ommeyyades ruled for less than a century, but within that space of time the expansion of Islam was marvellous. Their capital was Damascus, and their authority stretched from the Indus to the Pyrenees, and from the Jaxartes to the Indian Ocean. In 757 A.D. the Ommeyyade dynasty closed tragically and the Abbasides came into the possession of the Caliphate. In the Abbaside family it remained until it passed into the hands of the House of Osman in 1517 A. D.

The first Caliph of the Abbaside dynasty was elected to that high office in the Cathedral Mosque of Kufa, where the oath of fealty was sworn to him by the assembled congregation. He was succeeded by his brother Mansur, who was undoubtedly a man of considerable sagacity. He built Baghadad and made it a magnificent city. Long before western Europe had emerged from the darkness of the middle ages, Mansur had organized and established a carefully regulated machinery of government, which became a model both for Asia and Europe. An enumeration of the Boards which conducted the government would give an idea of the grasp of his intellect. To Mansur also belongs the credit of placing the Sunni church on a solid foundation.

It may, indeed, be said that all the first eight Caliphs of the Abbaside dynasty were men of exceptional ability. Harun-ar-Rashid and Mamun are entitled to rank with the great rulers of the world. Under the Ommeyyades, non-Muslim subjects had been, generally speaking, excluded from all avenues to posts of emolument and honour. Their fidelity was mistrusted and they were objects of suspicion, often not without reason. In England, Catholics and Jews suffered similar disabilities until quite recent times. The revolution which wrested the supreme power from the Ommeyyades and transferred it to their rivals, led to the establishment of a wide spirit of tolerance. The non-Arabs, as the subjects of a great and civilised empire, assumed their proper place as citizens of the Commonwealth of Islam; they were admitted to the

highest employments of State, and enjoyed equal consideration with the Arabs. The acceptance of this principle of racial equality among all their subjects helped the early sovereigns of the house of Abbas to build up a fabric which endured without a rival for over five centuries, and fell only before a barbarian attack from without. Harun-ar Rashid, after his conquests in Asia Minor in extension of the same principle, granted to the Greek inhabitants of the conquered territories equal rights with his Muslim subjects. This was in accordance with the rules laid down by the Prophet. But after their treacherous revolt and their massacre of the Muslims the great Caliph withdrew the immunities he had conferred on them and ordained that their garments should be of a different colour. This was not done as a mark of contempt for their faith, but as a protection against future treachery.

The glory of the Abbaside Caliphate began to decline with the accession of the ninth caliph of that dynasty in 847 A. D. The Turkish legionaries, like the Praetorian guards, then began to claim a voice in the election of the Caliph; and in 945 A. D. under the Caliph Mustakfi, the princes of Deilem, who are known in history as the Buyides, constituted themselves 'Mayors of the Palace'. The eldest received the title of Sultan and the practical government of the country passed into their hands. In spite, however, of the loss of their temporal authority, the spiritual prestige of the Abbaside caliphs in the Sunni world was so high that the Muslim conquerors and rulers who sprang up in Central Asia and elsewhere invariably solicited from the Pontiff his authorisation and his formal investiture, with the object of legitimising their rule and making insurrections against them illegal. It is a cardinal principle of the Sunni doctrine that so long as a duly elected Imam is not declared a 'transgressor' or forfeits his authority for desertion of his trust or breach of the sacred laws, any rising against him is regarded as unlawful. Hence the anxiety of the great chieftains to obtain the recognition of the Caliph. On receipt of the Firman and investiture the legitimacy of their title to rule became established. Mahmud of Ghazni obtained a diploma and robe of hour (*tashrif*) with which he was invested by the Caliph's envoy with impressive pomp and ceremony. He received the titles of Sultan and of *Yemin-ud-dowla* (the right hand of the Empire) and *Amin-ul-Millat* (Guardian of the Faith).

As the Ghaznavide power waned in Mid-Asia and the Buyides lost ground in Iraq, the Seljuks, a Turkish tribe settled in Khorasan, rose into prominence. The Caliph Kaim conferred on their Chief Tughril, a mighty conqueror, the dignity and title of Sultan and invested him with supreme temporal authority over the countries which recognised the spiritual sway of the Abbasides. This was continued to Alp Arslan, his successor in the over-lordship of the Seljukides. Alp Arslan smote the Byzantine at Malazkard, not many marches from the spot where the Greeks sustained their recent decisive defeat, and drove them out of Asia Minor. Alp Arslan's brilliant son, Malik Shah, patron of the astronomer-poet, Omar Khayyam, and of the famous administrator

Nizam-ul-Mulk, received also with the title of Sultan, that of *Jalal-ud-Dowla* ('Glory of the Empire'). On his death in 1093 A. D. his empire was partitioned among his sons, each of whom received the diploma of authorisation with the title of Sultan. With the decline of the Seljukides the temporal authority of the Caliphs grew. Until about the middle of the 12th century they regained full control in Iraq, Lower Mesopotamia and Fars. In 1226 A. D., Altamsh, the third Pathan King of Delhi, solicited the Caliph Mustansir for investiture. The route from Baghdad to Delhi was still open; and an embassy from the City of the Caliphs proceeded to Hindustan to hand the King the conveted diploma, conferring on him the title of Sultan and the authority to lead the prayers.

Thus through the long course of ages even when the Pontiff was, politically speaking, a mere cypher, the theory was scrupulously maintained, in accord with the religious law, that the delegation of temporal authority, whether absolute or partial, whether in toto or with reservations, emanated directly from the Vice-gerent of the Prophet: but the delegation could only be made to a Muslim. The student of history will no doubt observe a strange analogy between the rule of the Shariat and the theory of the British Constitution that the throne is the fountain of all authority. The Caliph Mustansir died in 1242 A. D. at the most critical period in the destiny of his house and of Saracenic civilisation. His son, Mustasim B'illah, the thrity-seventh and last Caliph of the House of Abbas, was weak, vacillating, and fond of pleasure; his Caliphate was one continuous record of disturbance at home and trouble abroad, culminating in the destruction of Bagdad by the Mongols in the year 1258 of the Christian era. The Caliph, together with his sons and the principal members of his family, perished in the general massacre; only those scions of the House of Abbas escaped the slaughter who were absent from the capital, or succeeded in avoiding detection.

For two years after this massacre the Sunni world was without an Imam and Caliph. The grief felt by Mussulmans at the absence of a spiritual Head of the Faith, and the acute need for a representative of the prophet to bring solace to the Faithful are pathetically voiced by the Arab historian of the Caliphs. The devotions of the living were devoid of that religious efficacy which is imparted to them by the presence in the world of the Vice-gerent of the Prophet. Appreciating the necessity of reviving the Caliphate, Sultan Baibars, who became master of Egypt in 1259 A.D., invited a member of the House of Abbas, Abul'l Kasim Ahmed, who had succeeded in making his escape, with the Prophet's relics, from the massacre, to come to Egypt for installation in the pontifical seat. On his arrival in the environs of Cairo, he was met by the Sultan, accompanied by the Judges and other great dignitaries and officers of State. Before the ceremony could take place his descent had to be proved before the chief Kazi (or judge). After this had been done, he was installed in the chair and acknowledged as Caliph, under the title of al-Mustansir b'illah—'Seeking the help of the Lord'. This occurred on the 12th

May 1261, and the new Caliph's name was impressed on the coinage and recited in the Khutba (the customary address after prayers). On the following Friday he rode to the mosque in procession, wearing the black mantle of the Abbasides, and delivered the pontifical sermon. As his installation as the commander of the Faithful was now complete he proceeded to invest the Sultan with the robe and diploma so essential for the exercise of legitimate authority.

The Abbaside Caliphate thus re-established lasted in Cairo for over two centuries and a half. During this period Egypt was ruled by chiefs who are designated in history as the Mameluke Sultans. Each Sultan on his accession to power received his investiture from the Caliph, and claimed to exercise his authority as the lieutenant and delegate of the Pontiff. The letters-patent appointing ministers of religion and administrators of justice usually bore the Caliph's sign-manual. Though shorn of all its temporal powers, the religious prestige of the Caliphate was so great, and the conviction of its necessity as a factor in the life of the people so deep rooted in the religious sentiments of the Sunnis that in the 14th century long after the fall of Baghdad, a Mussulman sovereign of India received his investiture from the Abbaside Caliph of Cairo.

The establishment of the small Turkish colony in Asia Minor, which in the course of less than four generations grew into a nation was almost coeval with the sack of Baghdad by the Mongols in 1258 A.D. Sultan Ala-ud-din, the last Seljukide King of the principality of Iconium, planted in the Sakaria Valley four hundred families who had, under Mongolian pressure, migrated from Khorasan to act as wardens of the marches against the Greeks. This small tract of unity became the cradle of the nation which took from Osman, the son of their original leader and their eponymous hero, of the name of Osmanli. Osman pronounced as Othman led to the origin in Europe of the term Ottoman. The expansion of this small principality was as remarkable as the vitality of its people. After their crushing defeat by Timut (Tamerlane) they recovered strength to resume their conquests in Europe so rapidly as to astonish and confound their enemies.

'The rapidity of their growth, (says Dr. Libyer), from so small a beginning, and under such apparently unfavourable circumstances, into a durable State is one of the marvellous things of history. In about two and a—quarter centuries from the time of their independence they were able to attempt for the last time to unite the entire Mediterranean civilisation into one empire. North Africa, Syria, Arabia, the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, Armenia, Asia Minor, Greece, the Balkan Peninsula, a large part of modern Austria-Hungary and of modern Russia, were theirs; they threatened Italy, Central and Eastern Europe and Persia. They thus held all three of the earliest centres of Mediterranean civilisation, the western half of the old Persian Empire, and all the dominions of Rome, except the north-western one third.'

Mohammed II, the Conqueror, captured Constantinople in 1453. Towards the end of the same century the star of Selim I, the grandson of the Conqueror,

rose in the horizon. His victories over the enemies of Islam won for him the title of 'Champion of the Faith'; no other Moslem sovereign, not even his great rival Shah Ismail, the founder of the Sufi dynasty in Persia and the creator of the first orthodox Shiah State, equalled the Osmanli monarch in greatness and power.

The closing decades of the fifteenth century had witnessed a vast change in the conditions of Egypt. A few years later the anarchy that had set in under the later Mamelukes reached its climax. Selim I was invited by a section of the Egyptian people to restore order and peace in the distracted country, and he easily overthrew the incompetent Mamelukes. He then proceeded to incorporate Egypt into his already vast dominions. The Caliph who at this period held the vice-gerency of the Prophet bore the pontifical name al-Mutawwakil 'ala-Allah (contented in the 'grace of the Lord'). He perceived that the only Moslem sovereign who could, by combining in his own person the double functions of Caliph and Imam, restore the Caliphate of Islam in the theory and in fact, and discharge effectively the duties attached to that office, was Selim. He accordingly in 1517, by a formal deed of assignment, transferred the Caliphate to the Ottoman conquerer and with his officials and dignitaries 'made the *Bai'at* on the Sultan'. In the same year Selim received the homage of the Sherif of Mecca, a descendant of Ali, who despatched his son to present on a silver salver the keys of the Kaaba, and took the oath by the same proxy. The combination in Selim of the Abbaside right by assignment and by *Bai'at*, and the adhesion of the representative of the Prophet's House, who held at the time the guardianship of the Holy Cities, perfected the Ottoman Sultan's title to the Caliphate, 'just as the adhesion of Ali had completed the title of the first three Caliphs'. The solemn prayers with the usual *Khutba* offered in Mecca and Medina to the Sultan gave the necessary finality to the right of Selim. Henceforth Constantinople his seat of government, became the Dar-ul-Khilafat, and began to be called Islambol 'The City of Islam'. Before long envoys arrived in Selim's court and that of his son, Solyman the Magnificent, from the rulers of the Sunni States to offer their homage; and thus, according to the Sunnis, the Caliphate became the heritage of the House of Osman, which they have enjoyed for four centuries without challenge or dispute.

The whole account of the installation of Selim on the pontifical throne is set out in the monumental work of the great Swedish scholar, d'Ohsson, who had unique facilities of access to the imperial archives in Constantinople. His work was published in 1787. Ibn Ayas, the Egyptian historian, refutes the story that Selim 'forced' Mutawwakil to assign the Caliphate to him. According to Ibn Ayas both Selim and Salyman treated Mutawwakil with consideration.

The title of Sultan was for the first time bestowed by the Abbaside Caliph Wasik upon one of his Turkish Generals. It seems to have remained virtually in abeyance until the Buyides rose to power, when it was conferred on those princes. Afterwards it was bestowed, as we have seen, on the Seljukide

sovereigns, on Mahmud of Ghazni and the Indo-Moslem rulers. Until the Caliphate was assigned to Selim, the two dignitary were quite separate, in fact one was the title of a dignitary of the Empire, whilst the other was the designation of the religious head of the Sunni Commonwealth. When Selim was invested with the Caliphate, he was already the Sultan of the Ottomans, and the two offices thus became combined in him. The title of Ameer-ul-Mominin, the 'Commander of the Faithful', also became his.

The combination of the Sultanate and the Caliphate in Selim and his successors naturally led to a clash of ideals. The Sultan as the chief of the Ottoman nation was an absolute monarch. His absolutism was, it is true, limited in practice by the Shariat and tempered by custom and usage, but he was in theory the sole master of the lives and liberty of his subjects. His will was law; and he could launch his people into war or get them out of it as he wished. This was the world-old conception of the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians, and the Byzantines. The Caliph, on the other hand, was the constitutional head of a Commonwealth, subject to the law, bound to act in consultation with his people. It must be admitted that the greatest of the Sultans did endeavour, and successfully, to maintain some harmony between absolutism and constitutionalism. They had no power to change the Shariat, but they had authority under the Shariat to issue from time to time rules and edicts to bring the institutions of the empire into harmony with advancing progress. In later times most of those edicts were sterilised by foreign opposition. The immense volume of *Kanuns* (Rules) and *Tanzimat* (regulations) bear testimony to the anxiety of the Ottoman rulers to keep pace with the times.

Nor were the Sultans in the period of their glory wanting in the virtues of simplicity. But untrammelled power in the hands of the best of men is apt to lead to incalculable evils. Turkey, the reign of the late Sultan Abdul Hamid furnishes the best example of the curse of despotism. Under the pressure of General Ignatieff, the Czar's ambassador, he closed down the first Turkish Parliament which had so auspiciously begun the work of regeneration, sent its author to die in exile, and for over 30 years ruled Turkey as an irresponsible despot. Much as we may regret the disappearance of an institution and a title with which the most glorious period of Turkish history is intimately linked, it can hardly be disputed that the Sultanate and its absolutism were wholly in conflict with the growing spirit of freedom in the world; and that if new Turkey was to take her place among the comity of free nations on a basis of equal rights and equal duties, the Sultanate was bound to go.

Possibly the name might have been preserved by transforming the institution into a constitutional monarchy. But the risk of intrigues in the hands of an unscrupulous sovereign desirous of shaking off the constitutional checks would undeniably have been great. Also the facilities it would have afforded to foreign powers to play him off against the State would have been dangerous to its safety. European history contains abundant warning against compromises

of the kind. The reformers accordingly adopted a drastic remedy against the mischief inherent in the system. The ex-Sultan is more to be pitied than condemned. What he did was done with the 'Big Stick' held over his head. Although there is much to be said in his exculpation, his acts, coupled with his flight will be taken as depriving him, under the Shariat of the right to the rulership of Islam.

The Caliphate seems to have been regarded by the later sovereigns of Turkey as a mere appanage to the Sultanate. In the world of Islam, on the other hand, the prestige of the Sultans rested on their religious headship. With the disappearance of the Sultanate, and the reversion to the rules and regulations which sanctify the installation of a constitutional head of the Islamic Commonwealth, the Caliphate now regains its pre-eminance. The problem of the Sultanate was peculiarly a question for the Turks themselves to solve; the *Caliphate* concerns the entire Sunni world. As above explained, the right to the headship was assigned to the House of Osman; it cannot be taken away from that family without the assent of the *entirety* of the Sunni people. Primarily the right of election to the office rests with the Ottoman nation through its constituted representatives, and has to be confirmed by the sacramental oath of featly. The direct or indirect assent and acceptance of the Sunnis outside the Turkish Empire perfects the title of the elected chief. Prayers offered in Mosques invoking blessing on him are tantamount to *bai'at* with his hand in the hands of the person taking the oath. The election and installation of the new Caliph seem to have been strictly in accordance with the requirements of the law, and of the rules hallowed by centuries of observance. Prayers, we understand, have been offered for him in the mosques throughout India and elsewhere. He has also, it appears, received the homage of the University of al-Azhar, which is held in high esteem all over north Africa and the East. The Pontiff of the Church of Rome was represented, we are told, at the installation by a special envoy; and it is curious to note that he was the only sovereign ruler who did this act of courtesy.

Judging from reports in the Press, the Turkish National Assembly appears to have invited representative delegation from all Sunni countries to discuss and decide on the question relating to the temporal powers of the new Caliph.

The Moslems of India are perfectly logical in their demand that the Caliphate of Constantinople should be left untouched by the Allied Powers; and that its temporal and spiritual authority should not be tampered with on any pretext whatsoever. Had they taken up any other position they would have acted contrary to the *Shariat*; and would have furnished to non-Moslem States a pretext for reducing the Caliphate to a shadowy religious institution without prestige or power. As the Caliph can under no cirmumstances be subordinate to a Christian State it would have placed Islam in conflict with the whole of Christendom.

The Turkish reformers seem to have begun well. With breadth of vision

and appreciation of the growing needs of humanity, they have, by their 'Fraternal Treaty' with Persia, put an end to the feud between Iran and Turan which had lasted since the beginning of history. What is more, the treaty puts an end to the deplorable schism which has for the last thirteen centuries divided Islam into two hostile sects. The abolition of the prohibition of marriages between Persians and Turks, and between Shiahs and Sunnis, is an achievement of which Mustapha Kemal Pasha and his colleagues may well be proud. To establish friendly relations with Afghanistan, Persia and the other neighbouring States reflects great credit on their statesmanship.

British policy towards the Moslem races has, within recent years, been an enigma. With the downfall of Czarism a unique opportunity was vouchsafed to England to obtain the cultural hegemony of the Moslem world. That opportunity has been deliberately thrown away. By fostering goodwill and the old trust she could have linked up with her all the followers of Islam from Egypt to China. Unfortunately, her policy took a different turn, which means the loss of a great asset to the Empire, the friendship of the millions among whom the name of England had stood high for justice and fairplay.

The opportunity lost by England has been seized by France, who now fills the role of England as the interpreter of Moslem sentiment. She has established recently a Mussulman hospital and helped in the foundation of a great mosque in Paris. Marshall Lyautey presided at the opening ceremony and his speech on the occasion is well-worthy of notice by statesmen and politicians who have the interests of the British Empire at heart. After combating the legend that Islam was a destructive, anarchical and intolerant force, and referring to the elements of social order to be found in all stages in Morocco, Algeria and Tunis, Marshall Lyautey continued :

'And now there appears in the East under Mustapha Kemal, who has revealed himself to be a true statesman, an effort at national restoration, construction and organization, towards which all our sympathies go out. France (liberal, orderly and laborious) and Islam (renewed and rejuvenated) appear to me to be two great and noble forces, whose union should be a preponderating factor in the peace of the world.'

The renaissance of Islam must come from within, and it is a matter for satisfaction that New Turkey has made this one of her ideals. Osmanli has a virile character : He only requires sympathetic co-operation to do his share in the culture and civilisation of Asia. A nation which could survive constant attacks delivered at short intervals* during the last century and a half against its national life and independence deserves sympathy and the support

* Leaving out the wars of the 18th Century, I would just mention those Turkey had to face in the 19th, *viz.*, 1812, 1829, 1849, 1856, 1877, 1897, 1911-12. It is no use referring to the War of 1914 into which she was dragged by Germany, nor the three-years War against the Greeks since 1919, which was solely due to the pro-Hellenic policy of Mr. Lloyd George. An excellent sketch of the Ottomans of Anatolia, who form the backbone of the Turkish nation, appeared in the August number of the *Review of Reviews*.

of all right minded people. It has proved its right to live. The programme which Mustapha Kemal Pasha published to the world the other day inspires the hope that the statesmen of New Turkey realise the complexity of the task before them. They will have to devote themselves not merely to the economic restoration of their devastated country, but also to the organization of the moral elements that go to constitute a great and civilised State, the development of education on national lines, with full regard to the necessities of the advancing tide of human progress†, the promotion of peace, concord and a feeling of security among all their subjects; improvement in the administration of justice; and above all an immediate arrangement, a concordat, safeguarding the privileges and prerogatives of the Caliph in accordance with the sentiments of the whole Moslem world.

The new Caliph is reported to be a man of culture and a scholar of attainments and intellectual gifts. He appears to be conversant with some at least of the European languages, and *au courant* with the politics of the world. This is a happy augury for the renaissance of Islam. It is to be hoped that, given the opportunity, he may, in co-operation with the representatives of the people, revive the memories of earlier days by his interest in promoting the public weal. Perhaps he may be able to pave the way for a better understanding between Islam and Christendom. Where humbler men have failed, the Caliph Abdul Medjid may attain success.‡

Source: The Edinburgh Review, January, 1923.

56

LETTERS FROM MOHAMED ALI TO JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, 1923

I

I cannot tell you how much I regret my inability to attend the first political conference of my own province held since my release; but I trust after my unorthodox telegram you are convinced that I would have been with you if it had at all been possible. After my return from Delhi I was far from well

† Under Mussulman law sex is no disqualification for any office under the State. Abu Hanifa declared that a woman can hold the office of a Judge. The appointment in Angora a little while ago of an accomplished lady as Minister of Education is an object lesson to Modern Europe.

‡ According to the *Echo de l'Orient*, he strongly opposed Turkey being dragged into the War of 1914, which made him most unpopular with the Germans and the men then in power in Constantinople.

and fever which held me in its grip for several days made me give up my visit to Almora which had been arranged for the 1st October. I had barely recovered when a strong Almora contingent took me to this stronghold of non-cooperation and I had to follow my old friend Sir William 'Malice' (Marris) almost like Nemesis.

My daughter's temperature had very appreciably gone down during my absence at Delhi when the weather was dry and bright here, being on average 100° in the afternoons and 101° in the evenings. But it began to be wet again a couple of days before I returned with the result that during the next 10 days or so the temperature gradually rose to 103° again. Since the 5th instant, however, Amina has been better again and her temperature is 100° in the afternoons and 101.4° in the evenings. In fact I look forward to great improvement in October and would like to remain with her throughout the month in order to make the most of this weather through careful nursing – in truth 'make hay while the sun shines'. But then Shaukat's release which may now take place any day, must keep me on the move and I am leaving for the Bombay Presidency. As I cannot hope to return before the 7th November if Shaukat's release takes place no earlier than the very last day, viz., 31st October, Amina is naturally unwilling to let me go. It was with the greatest difficulty that she allowed me to proceed to Jullunder for the 17th and 18th. For this purpose I had intended to leave here on 15th but as Maulana Abdul Bari who had so graciously excused me not proceeding to Lucknow and was himself coming here was twice prevented from doing so, I have now arranged to leave Bhowali on the 14th and to proceed to Lucknow which I leave for Jullundur on the 16th. You must join me on the 16th by the Punjab Mail. We have so much to talk and decide upon. Please convey to your Conference my extreme regret at my unavoidable absence. If I could have been with you believe me I would not have lagged behind. I do hope your conference will soon remove from U. P. the reproach of being the 'Disunited Provinces'. Let the Provincial Congress assembly send from the secred soil of Kashi itself the message of the greater and more solid *sanghathan*, the *sanghathan* of the National Congress, which should aim at the union of all down-trodden and oppressed humanity suffering untold torture and humiliation under the heel of Europe. And let us all go forth from this Conference truly *shuddh*, purged of all narrowness, bigotry and intolerance in order to free motherland from the most cramping slavery – the slavery not only of the body but also of the soul. May God crown your efforts with success and out of His bounty give us all fresh courage and determination and the will to win. If there is still anything of the old world spirituality in Kashi, let us recommence the work of our great chief, Gandhiji, in the spirit of religious devotion and utter unworldliness. That way alone lies salvation of India and of the East and in fact of all humanity.

II

Many thanks for your letter of the 1st. We really missed you a great deal at Jullundur and Amritsar and particularly at Lahore where the 'leaders' are hopelessly narrow-minded. To think that 'Non-cooperators' who insisted on lawyers abandoning their practice should now be quarrelling about the percentage of posts allotted by a Co-operating Minister (who happens to be a Mussulman) to Hindus and Muslims ? I could see little of Gandhism in these Lahore leaders except a little in Santanam and a few others and yet it was the Humiliation of the Punjab that had roused all India. Really the Punjab is an eternal puzzle to me. That men who are on occasions so brave, who provide the bulk of British Indian forces and who are so quick to anger, should so soon forget the gross insults of the British to which they were subjected and should be content to remain under the heel of their alien tyrants rather than cease quarrelling among themselves for petty and insignificant things, is quite unintelligible to me. We have successfully urged on Venkatapayya now to hold the Working Committee meeting at Amritsar to deal with the question of the Sikhs and we shall no doubt also discuss the communal dissensions in the Punjab and the U. P. Your presence is indispensable and I shall never forgive you if you get ill again ? Do keep well and help us to come to a proper decision at Amritsar. I shall be there on the 12th by the Lucknow Mail.

If you hadn't written to me about the reality of the Reading reception at Allahabad the *Leader*'s glowing descriptions might perhaps have led me to suspect Allahabad's loyalty to you and your father and to the ideals you have placed before it. But then we know the *Leader* too. Its Bombay correspondent had the audacity to proclaim that no more than 50 people received me at the station on my arrival at Bombay. As it happened, however the ubiquitous photographer and cinema man were there and the Sunday *Bombay Chronicle* published a photograph in which you could perhaps count 2 to 3 thousand persons. All I know is that I had to fight my (way) through the crowd to the carriage awaiting Mother and me. Well, well, we know the *Leader* and its 'brood'.

Source : A Bunch of letters written mostly to Jawaharlal Nehru.

57

FOURTH SESSION OF THE JAMAIT-UL-ULEMA CONFERENCE

Gaya, 24 December 1923

Amongst the Conferences, besides the National Congress, held at Gaya were two religio-political meetings of great significance. These were the All-India Hindu Mahasabha and the Jamait-ul-Ulema. Both, though strictly speaking only religious organisations, took for the first time at Gaya a distinctly political colour and joined hands with the N. C. O. Congress thus giving it a positive religious sanction. The Jamait-ul-Ulema (congregation of Muslim religious leaders) opened its 4th Session at Gaya on the 24th December in its own spacious and well-decorated pandal with several thousands of Muslim divines from all over India and a sprinkling of Muslim laymen and non-Muslim visitors. For the first time since its constitution the Jamait-ul-Ulema held its sitting during the Congress week.

Maulana Habibul Rahman of Deoband, the President-elect could not arrive in time. The Conference opened in his absence with recitations from the holy Quran and National poems. Thereafter Maulana Abdul Rauf of Dinapur read out his printed address as Chairman of the Reception Committee. The Conference then adjourned for a short time for another sitting during the day.

The two addresses, that of the President-elect (Maulvi Habibul Rahman of the University at Deoband, which is a recognised centre of Islamic learning of the world), and of the Chairman of the Reception Committee (Maulvi Abdul Rauf), were remarkable for the exposition of clerical opinion on the controversy regarding the Khilafat. Both hoped Angora would keep in view that the Indian Mahommedans considered that the Sultanate and the Khilafat must be vested in one and the same person, who may be elected, but who should enjoy the title of 'His Majesty' and must possess both temporal and spiritual powers. A great decision about the question of Council entry was given by the Conference even before the Congress and Khilafat Committees could make up their mind.

Unusually large numbers of delegates attended and there were also many Hindu and Sikh visitors. Several prominent Congress leaders were seated on the dais.

Maulana Abdul Rauf, Chairman, Reception Committee, in welcoming the delegates read a long address in Urdu. He said that the Cross was today pitted against the Crescent, and Europe was trying to drive Turkey out of its small European possessions. British rule in India had not only deprived them of manhood, by always teaching the Indians to hate war, while they the British were themselves making greater preparations for war, for the so-called

purpose of maintaining peace, but the clauses of the Penal Code were placed above the laws of God and the Rulers wanted them to remain loyal while Islam was being destroyed by them. In such a state of affairs the duty of the Indian Mahommedan was clear. They should be ever grateful to the Kemalists for saving Islam from extinction. But the Turkish victories had given birth to new problems, regarding the future of Islamic practices dealing with the position of the Khilafat. Maulvi Abdul Rauf said that the Khilafat could be both elected and nominated, and could be deposed. The Khilafat need not be confined in any family and he saw no reason why it should have been confined to Osman. No one could be a Khalifa unless he possessed both spiritual and temporal powers. He knew that the present time was against personal rule, that such a rule in the case of the Sultan had been abused. But Islamic law contemplated no other form of government. A Khalifa may be deposed and a new one elected. But when a Khalifa was appointed he ought to enjoy both the spiritual and temporal powers. The Speaker did not know how far the reports regarding Angora's decision depriving the new Khalifa of temporal powers was true, but if it was, he took exception to it. Rather than curtailing the powers of the Khalifa the Speaker's opinion was that the Khilafat should be a living force, that all Muslim States such as Turkey, Afghanistan, Persia, Bokhara, Khiva, Arabia and Iraq should owe allegiance to the Khalifa who would grant them all internal autonomy and could control the foreign policy of all such Muslim States, so that in time of war the forces of all these States may muster to defend Islam. He added that in the case of countries iike India which had passed from Muslim control the Shariat laid down that the Khalifa should send to such countries his own nominee who would settle their disputes and guide them. He hoped that the Jamait-ul-Ulema would now attempt to put right this shortcoming.

Touching political issues in this country Maulvi Abdul Rauf said that non-cooperation had revolutionised the Indian mind, but its great success was prevented by the Bardoli mistake of its author in suspending the offensive. He ridiculed the idea of capturing Councils for doing nothing. Would not that mean useless waste ofthe country's energy and funds ? Congress candidates would not be able to achieve more through Councils than the present Councillors and the talk about paralysing the government through Councils was as futile as the promise of attainment of Swaraj in three months.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

In the absence of the President-elect, who had not till then arrived, the Presidential Address was read out by Moulvi Shabbit Ahmed of Deoband.

Maulvi Habibul Rahman of Deoband gave a very long address in Urdu, covering forty-two printed pages which took three hours to read. It was throughout listened with close attention and was occasionally punctuated with applause.

CROSS VS. CRESCENT

He said that throughout her life Islam had Christianity as its main and traditional enemy. The latest attempt of the victorious Cross to destroy Islam was after the great War when the Allies imposed on Turkey a treaty which smashed her power completely. Islam had in the past withstood several attacks solely because of her spiritual strength. For several centuries Turks had defended her and even today Turks had not only again saved her from extinction but was alone among Muslim states sufficiently powerful to defend their faith against the aggressor. Muslims of the world owed a great debt of gratitude to Kemalists. He was therefore suprised to find in some quarters hostile criticism of the Turks. He conceded that Turks being human were liable to err and Indian Mahommedans should respectfully represent their views to Angora. The Maulana said that the fact that Angora was summoning a Conference of Muslim leaders from all over the world to frame the laws of Turkey in accordance with the Shariat proved the anxiety of the Kemalists to observe the Quranic law. He was sure that as spirituality had all along saved Islam, Kemalists would not go against the Shariat (God's law) or introduce innovations inconsistent with it. Touching the position of the Khilafat the Maulana observed that a Khalifa may be elected and also deposed if undesirable, that his powers may even be made normal by constitutional delegation, but that the authority of the Khalifa as such must be supreme. The Sultanate and the Khilafat could not be separated and there could be no Khalifa unless he enjoyed both spiritual and temporal powers. His title must also remain 'His Majesty'. The speaker felt sure that Angora would pay attention to this respectful representation of the Indian Muslim view regarding the position of the Khilafat and that the Jamait-ul-Ulema would be recognised by the Turkish Government and its help sought in the solution of religious issues. The Maulana also praised the services of the Osman family whose members for over six centuries had ruled more than any other dynasty. He suggested that Mustapha Kemal Pasha be given the title 'Mujadid-i-Khilafat' (Saviour of Khilafat) for his services in giving Islam a new birth.

THE INDIAN SITUATION

The Maulana next dwelt upon the special responsibilities of the Jamait-ul-Ulema. He claimed for its superiority over all other Muslim organisations or Conferences in India and declared that in time to come it would represent a unique position in the world so as to lead Muslim opinion in religious matters, but as politics and religion were inseparable in Islam, the Jamait was also competent to give the lead on political issues. And as the betterment of Islam could be achieved only if India was autonomous, the Jamait had placed above all efforts at securing independence. If they were to succeed in shaking off slavery it was essential that Hindus and Mahommedans should work united, but as occasions had arisen when religious disputes had seriously interferred with unity, he suggested that a joint committee of fair-minded

Hindu and Mahommedan leaders should sit and recommend measures to be adopted by both parties to avoid all possible chance of religious or other conflicts.

ON COUNCIL ENTRY

Touching the controversy regarding the Congress programme, he emphasised that N-C-O was a religious obligation on Mahommedans and, according to the last Fatwa of the Ulemas, Mahommedans could neither co-operate nor take oath of allegiance. They could not therefore sit in the Councils, even if they succeeded at the polls. The only alternative consistent with the Fatwa was that pointed out by the resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of Jamait-ul-Ulema on the 11 November last. This decision permitted the capturing of seats but refusing to take the oath. The Maulana thought that this course offered a ground for compromise between the two opposite views, but asked whether all the bother and expense of fighting the elections would be worth the compensatory gain. If it was, they may adopt that course and save division in their ranks. His own view was that the best course to follow was to carry on vigorously the constructive programme of N-C-O which offered real ground for solid and useful work.

In conclusion, Maulana Habibul Rahman urged the necessity for the widening of their organisation and carrying propaganda to the masses. He hoped that soon provincial heads of the Shariat, and later on, an All-India Amir of Shariat would be elected to lead Mahommedans in the right course.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, 1923.

58

TENTH SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE

Cocanada, 27 December 1923

The tenth All-India Khilafat Conference met at 8 a.m. in a special and spacious pandal erected for the occasion.

As soon as the Conference assembled a flag, said to have been presented to the Indian Muslims by Khilafat-ul-Musalmin, was brought in procession and the whole audience rose to pay homage to it amidst cries of 'Allah-o-Akbar.'

The proceedings began with prayers from 'Al-Quran'. Then the Chairman of the Reception Committee, Mr. Anwar-ulzaman, read his address. He wished prosperity to the Turkish Republic and urged redoubling

of efforts to secure freedom of Khilafat. He deprecated Shuddhi and Sangathan movements and urged their abandonment.

Dr. Ansari then proposed Maulana Shaukat Ali to the chair in a felicitious speech seconded by Messrs. Jawaharlal Nehru, Yakub Hassan and others. The President was then garlanded amidst cheers. The following is the translation of Maulana Shaukat Ali's Presidential address which was delivered in Urdu.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

'Allah-O-Akbar ! Brothers,—It is a matter of great happiness to me that, with your permission, in my capacity as President of this year's All India Khilafat Conference held at Cocanada, I am in a position to express my views about the stupendous work we have before us. You may be knowing that when released from the Betul jail, we, Mahomed Ali and myself, both went straight to Amritsar which had become an important battlefield after the Jallianwalla tragedy. You had done me the great honour of electing me as President of the Khilafat Conference in my absence this time. When I was in jail, I very much wanted that you should once more confer upon me this great honour this year also. We could not get any news from outside the jail. Nevertheless, accounts of the relaxation of efforts, and unpleasant communal disturbances did reach us from time to time. But I assure you, in spite of the iron gates of the jail and its four walls, never was I dismayed nor did I lose heart for a minute. On the contrary, I always felt that the real time of work had at last arrived. It was for this reason that I looked forward to your conferring upon me the honour of electing me your President a second time so that I might be enabled to relate before you and the world at large the feelings that surged in my heart in the hope that these feelings of mine might perhaps touch the proper chord in your hearts.

'Having heard my story, they are pleased :

'I hear now that they have sent for a story-teller.'

I am grateful to my dear brother and friend, Dr. Kichlew, and also to my revered brother and companion of the Karachi jail, Pir Ghulam Majadid Saheb, who, through some mysterious telepathic influences, divined my innermost feelings and withdrew their candidature for the Presidentship of this Conference.

I hope I can rely on your indulgence if by way of digression I avail myself of this opportunity to tell you that, after a continued experience and close companionship of almost four years I have found in my brother Saifuddin Kitchlew a sincere, honest, selfless, and undaunted and intrepid worker. Along with others he and I were co-Secretaries of the Central Khilafat Committee. We lived in the same room and were thrown together all the twenty four-hours of the day. In each other's constant company I had full control over all the activities and, instead of being an impediment in the

way his services were at all times ungrudgingly placed at my disposal. I doubt if my own brother Mahomed Ali would have assisted me so loyally. God be thanked that even in these days of adversity, we have got amongst us men of such stamp and calibre who command the confidence and respect not only of the Punjab but of the whole of India. This is a meagre but sincere acknowledgment of his services that I am making before you from this platform today. As to my revered brother Pir Ghulam Mujadid, is there any one amongst us here in this assembly today who, having met him once, has not carried away with him an indelible impression on his heart, of his undoubted sincerity, profound devotion, self-sacrifice and true Islamic fervour ? All these noble qualities were fully demonstrated in the jail at Karachi, and on coming out of the jail it gave me great pleasure to learn that the first man who gave whole-hearted support to the resumption of Civil Disobedience was our brave Pir Saheb. Here is the man who, along with his hundreds of thousands of followers, will be the first to take the field and revive the old traditions of the simple and sincere Muslims of the decayed and pristine glories of Islam.'

Brothers, you are fully aware that I am neither a learned theologian nor can I claim to possess complete mastery of the political situation of the day. I have also no hesitation in confessing that in matters connected with the Khilafat and the Islamic world, many of my colleagues and co-workers possess greater knowledge than myself. There is however one thing which impelled me to entertain the ambition of presiding over the deliberations today and that is that, in the matter of understanding the feelings and mentality of the generality of the Mussulmans, there is not one amongst my co-religionists who can claim greater knowledge than myself. I enjoy this privilege not only because I constantly came in contact with them, but also as I belong to their own class and lacking full knowledge in matters religious and secular, I unhesitatingly draw upon the learning of the Ulemas on the one hand and the experience and sagacity of the political leaders on the other, and both have always ungrudgingly placed their help and advice entirely at my disposal. Do not, gentlemen, therefore, expect to hear to day a learned address replete with political wisdom and sagacity or full of minute intricacies respecting the legal and constitutional position of the Khilafat. What I will say will be the story of the sufferings of the heart of a simple-minded Mussulman who profits from experience and relies on his zeal and love for Islam and trusting God jumps into the fray regardless of consequences and renders whatever service he can.

'Oh Bulbul, keep on crying and bewailing.'
'Oh guest of the Cage, keep on entertaining the flowler.'
'Be it wailing, crying or heart-burning sigh.'
'Oh thou unhappy heart, keep on doing what thou can'st'.

HOPES AND ASPIRATION

Brothers, before I open to you the volumes of my hopes and aspirations regarding the work before us, I should like, with your permission, to reiterate plainly and in unequivocal terms, the views of my co-religionists to the British Government. These views are not the views of the learned and the educated section only, but they are the views of the man in the street. Also these ideas agitate the minds of every Muslim, man or woman, howsoever occupied he or she may be, at least once in 24 hours. Great Britain should clearly understand that sufferings and disasters have at last roused the Muslim world. Every fresh difficulty, hardship and calamity, every fresh plunder of a Muslim country, every fresh attempt at dissension among the faithful, no matter howsoever successful it may appear, shall have but one and only one result—it will rouse the Muslims to a greater consciousness of their responsibilities and prepare them still better to discharge their duties as Muslim. I take back your minds to 1910 and 1911 and compare the then state of affairs with the conditions obtaining in 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923 and what you see today is only the beginning of what is to follow. Greater difficulties are still ahead. Every Muslim now understands Great Britain. Ask any Muslim in any part of the globe—*Who is the greatest enemy of Islam*? You will get only one reply—*Great Britain and the English nation.* I honestly and truly declare that this answer is a correct one. We are not foolish children and cannot be deceived by sweet words. Thank God, we have able men amongst us who are capable of shouldering the responsibilities of the most important of the chancellories of Europe. We are fully aware that it is due to the wrong Muslim policy of her ministers that her Empire is showing visible signs of disintegration and if our warning is not listened to the result will be nothing but wreck and ruin. It is only the beginning.

ATTEMPTING THE IMPOSSIBLE

To the British Government the President said : 'You may hang Maulana Abul Kalam, impale Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, crucify Maulana Abdul Majid, blow Dr. Kitchlew from the mouth of the gun, hack Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari to pieces, grind Mahommed Ali, Shaukat Ali and their friends to dust and scatter it to the winds so that no trace of it may be found anywhere, and alongwith these destory that true and religious Hindus who fought shoulder to shoulder with the Muslim......believes that in the war of right and wrong it is the duty of truly religious-minded person to side with the righteous. Nay, 'bury alive' that brave sirdar of Hindustan in Yerwada or light the fire and burn him alive as a martyr on the funeral pire—do all this but you cannot kill this genuine movement. All such attempts will lead to the disruption of the Empire. I request you with all respect and if it be necessary with folded hands, not to ignore or treat us with indifference after our loud and repeated protests. This attitude will not benefit you in the long run. The

time will come when you will be forced to accede to our demands and your belated acceptance of them will be of no avail nor will it then help you to say that you did not know. We have told you many a time before and we repeated it once more that not all the Empires of the world, not all the wealth and treasure this earth holds, not all the kingdoms of the world, not even the choicest things this universe can boast of, can hold against an inch, nay not even an atom of the holy land of Jazirat-ul-Arab and the holy places. You have therefore to revise your foreign policy and change its orientation or else under the present circumstances there can be but one course left to a God-fearing Muslim, man or woman. So long as one inch of the Jazirat-ul Arab is under non-Muslim influence, a Muslim cannot have peace of mind. Today looking to our disorganised condition and weakness you may laugh at my assertions. You may treat our warning with contempt, set up against us any number of our weak-hearted Muslim brethren, including some of the so-called Ulemas, strangle us with the brute force at your command. But just as the Divine existence cannot be obliterated by these puerile efforts, so also this movement set on foot by His humble devotees cannot be destroyed. The Holy Quran very clearly lays down for us :

'They entertain the intention of puffing the Light of God, while He has determined to make it perfect, no matter how much the infidels take it ill.'

'My prayer, my virtue, my life, my death, my standing, my sitting, and my every work is for my real Master, my real King and for that Master who is the owner of both the worlds, and is the Creator.'

We had forgotten this teaching and hence had sided with you, helped you in the war and formed two-third of the army which wrested Jerusalem from the hands of the soldiers of Islam, the brave Turks and the Khilafat, our Rasul, and handed it over to you. These unfortunate Mussulmans had, for the paltry sum of ten or fifteen rupees, owing to their ignorance, disregarded the divine word and struck at the very root of Islam.

Although I was not your enemy before, now I am your enemy as well as of your Government. Believe me and don't listen to the advice of your councillors and flatterers. I pledge you that even in the heart of such flatterers comes the thought of a Prophet and of God now and then, though not daily, and would also feel sorry like me. I feel sorry for these men and my heart grieves for them. I pray to God that just as he is kind on me and on you, so also would he brighten their hearts with a light-ray that they may also join us, throwing their caps in the air and shouting mad like 'Analhaq'. It is of course possible. To be hopeless of this fervour is a sin.

'We have never abstained from the commission of sin.

'But God has never aggreived our heart.

'We tried our level best (to go to) the hell.

'But Thine kindness did not like it.'

My word may seem harsh to you but if you hear them with patience you would come to know that this is no bitter poison. On the other hand it contains the keynote of your Government and of your nationality. Mahommedans are now wide awake and the drowsiness has vanished away. Every day would see them taking long strides towards progress. Retrogression is now impossible. My God and His Quran never speaks false :

'Among the weakest houses the weakest is of spider. All the efforts of the infidels and the heretics for deceiving the Mahommedans would be destroyed like the spider's web.'

It is why my brother and my aged mother and like us many of our co-workers, are determining to enter the field in the name of God without caring a bit for life and do not take rest so long as we do not attain our aim.

'O' Curiosity be happy for some good news is coming.

'Today the morning breeze is coming.'

I can say that in my childhood the first man who has produced any effect upon my heart was an Englishman whose name I am not ashamed to mention viz. Theodore book who has taught me and other young Mahommedans to dream the prosperity of Islam. And with it he had also taught me that there should always exist friendship between the English and the Mahommedans. Since then I and my sect lived with the English people in the play ground, clubs, meetings, and in every other thing. We have seen that after the Crimean War, either owing to the fear of Russia or for our sake Britain was considered as the friend of the Khilafat and of the Mahommedans. In 1911-12, I, with his Highness the Aga Khan, made a tour round India in the capacity of the Secretary of the Muslim University to gather a fund of thirty lakhs in order to fulfil the daily increasing conditions of the Government. I had then a great desire that the Emperor of India may press such an electric button at Delhi that the Royal Muslim University may spring up at Aligarh. For 17 years I have served in the Excise Department of the Government in the capacity of a high official. My notorious younger brother Mohammed Ali besides Aligarh, has also passed four years in their Oxford University and I know that he had great love for them. Thousands of the Mahommedans of India by becoming faithful to this Government have lost many of their own rights and of their country, and having forgotten the teachings of the Quran, enlisted themselves in the army for the sake of 15 rupees and gave proof of their fidelity in cutting the throats of their own brethren in Afghanistan, Persia, Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Sudan, Somaliland, and in every country.

After all, would it not be proper for the Government to see why this great change has come up among Mahommedans instead of sending us to jails and putting us to torture ?

JAZIRAT-UL-ARAB

Was it really the fault of the Mahommedans or that having taken advantage of our ignorance, they have made us to destroy our religion with our own hands ? Just think over your Islamic policy. Call today high responsible officials—Mian Mohammed Shafi, Sir Abdul Rahim, Mian Fazl-i-Husain, Nawad Sahib Chhatari, Nawab Ali Choudhri, Mr. Ghulam Husain Hedayet Ullah, Sir Habib Ullah of Madras, Ibrahim Rahmat Ullah of Bombay and Delhari Sahib—and ask them to tell you whether the claims of the Central Khilafat Committee are in accordance with religion true or false. It is my belief that the only answer which would be given is this that the claims about the Khilafat, the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and Holy places are word by word true. The safety of the Government lies in this that as soon as it is possible it would retrace its steps and repent for its mistakes with a sincere heart. Even if the inhabitants of the Jazirat-ul-Arab ask you to live there, you should then leave them, go back to your own country, and never think of that barren desert again. Here lies your safety. In 1912 when Khuddam-i-Kaba was founded and when I was working under Maulana Abdul Bari as a secretary, I saw the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi in that connection. At the very outset in order to influence my heart he expressed his anger with me and said, 'When there is already Sahib Ahmar, then what is the use of Hilal Ahmar and what is this Khuddam-i-Kaba?' When in response to this question my tongue began to utter words swiftly he said, 'I can't follow you as you speak so swiftly. Speak slowly.'

I laughed within myself and in reply showed my tongue to him and said 'This is too thick. I cannot speak slowly. It is our misfortune that you have got a bad ear and I a bad tongue.' Such a talk from a man dressed like myself had a very sobering effect on him. He thought it better to change his tone. After this I spoke to him plainly and said : 'That land is all sand and rock lent to the Mussulmans, it is dearer than the paradise itself and it was sure to prove a veritable hell to the non-Muslims casting covetous glances on it.' At this he laughed heartily and said, 'You need not be so very anxious. We have got Australia, Canada and a number of other colonies. We are inhabitants of a cold country, what shall we do with a hot country? Why should we go there?' I said : 'You are welcome to your colonies, Australia, Canada and all. We have no designs against them.' But no number of such conversations and writings can have any effect. The developments which took place after this interview are known to everyone. I should once more like to inform Great Britain in plain words that if they want to be at peace with the four hundred million Mussulmans of the world she should leave Jerusalem, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, Yemen, Nejd, Syria, Palestine, in short the whole of the Jazirat-ul-Arab to the inhabitants of that land and the Mussulmans at large.

Now I want to say a few words more. In 1913 I went to Deoband for the first time in order to seek the help of the Ulemas of that place for re-establish-

ing Khuddam-i-Kaba. At the time there was peace in the country. The Ulemas had kept themselves away from those movements which had the slightest tinge of politics and we were not receiving from them that assistance which we deserved. The fear of the Government was very great and no one had the courage to oppose them. That was the time for work when enemies were more and friends less. It was the time for walking in the way of God.

Dear friends, can't you recall that time when our movement was started in the beginning of 1920? Then there was no understanding, not a pie in our coffers; and no place for doing office-work. For the support of the Khilafat there were only a few men like Mian Mohammed Hajee Jan Mohammed Chhotani and some of his friends. The mass of our people were aware of this but there was no special arrangement. Thanks to God that after the Conference of Amritsar, arrangements for pecuniary help had been made. The first contribution that came to the Khilafat Fund was by an anonymous Zamindar of the Punjab whose name they would be astonished to hear. By the grace of God our movement grew stronger and stronger day by day till the Mahommedans of all the countries began to take part in it. Moreover, two great Hindu leaders, Lokamanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi, who were respected by the whole country, promised to help the movement. After February, Mahatma Gandhi began to take an active part so much so that he called himself a worker of the Khilafat. He used to tour round India in furtherance of Khilafat work and at last was arrested for writing an article on the Khilafat problem. I am to tell you that the Non-cooperation movement which is now so successful and powerful, was embraced by the Mahommedans with full reliance upon God and with the advice of Mahatma Gandhi in the Hindu-Muslim Conference of Allahabad. The Government was asked to consider our claims and accept them by the end of August. At Allahabad we had not much hope of the help of the Hindus but at three O'clock in the night of the holy month of Ramzan, we had resolved to sacrifice our everything for fulfilling that religious duty. And we determined we would not take rest till great God made us successful.

KHILAFAT DEPUTATION

Our deputation was doing its work and stating our claims before the ministers of England, Italy, and France. The movement spread day by day, thanks to the efforts of the Mahatma Gandhi and his friends, and you would be glad to hear that as the Congress had no Fund at the time, the Khilafat Fund contributed to the expenses of Madras, Gujarat and the United Provinces Congress Committees. Finally in September the Special Congress of Calcutta made the Khilafat a national problem. It was again approved at the Nagpur Congress. Thousands of Mahommedans and Hindus came out to work. We were under the impression that the Government would use their discretion and not make matters worse. On the other hand, the Government spent all their efforts to check the movement. The first attack was upon the Mahommedans

which resulted in the famous case of Karachi. The coming of the Prince of Wales, the boycotting, the filling of the jails, and the imprisonment of Desabandhu Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and Mahatma Gandhi were all known to the public. The work was spoiled in the absence of the workers. No worker remained. Weak-minded Mahommedans and Hindus came out in great numbers to destroy the soul-invigorating movement of liberty. No movement of the world and specially that of freedom and liberty was without its ups and downs. If they had victory today, to-morrow they would get defeat, but the courageous, patient and persevering nations always got victory in the long run. America fought for her freedom for 6 years. In the seventh year of that war, America had for her army neither clothes nor money. No one was willing to take the national notes. The soldiers were flying to their respective houses in distress. Even the Commandar-in-Chief took a bribe of thirty-three-thousand pounds from England and left the country in distress. In spite of all these, in the eighth year, small groups of brave men were formed and with great courage, patience, and perseverence began to fight the English. At the end of the eighth year they turned out the English from America. The pride of the Englishmen which found expression in the Tea Party at Boston vanished. The English are up to this time repenting for it and admit their mistake. The British committed the same mistake in the case of Ireland and were repeating it on a large scale in the case of India. If that would not be rectified, the result would be similar *i.e.*, those who fight for truth and liberty always succeed. Let them remember the events of Karbala and see what the Abbasides had done. Now there was no trace of the Bani Umyades and their tombs. What happened in America, in the French Revolution, and in Ireland, and what was happening today in Egypt. If they were faithful and persevering in their efforts—which they were—they were bound to receive from God that help, which led to victory. They could now see the glimpses of it.

THE AFGHAN SITUATION

In this connection, I want to tell the Government the views of the Afghans regarding the Mahommedans. The Mahommedans of Afghanistan are our brethren. It is our desire that they pass their lives as a free, God-fearing nation. We remain happy in our house and they in theirs. Being our neighbours we are ready to help them in every way. They may do us service which they can. The former frontier policy has been proved barren. They are spoiled by giving them thousands of rupees as bribe. They are made greedy and avaracious and instead of helping them their morals are spoiled. But its last result is now known to all of us. Now the treatment of the Government with them is very cruel. For trifling things and lame excuses airships are sent there, their houses are bombarded, and their little children are killed. This brave nation bears all this and when they get opportunity they kill an Englishman, a Hindu, or a Mahommedan whosoever happened to come before them and in

this way they avenge themselves. Most often the Hindu and the Mahommedan soliders are sent against them which breeds a sort of enmity with us.

In the Nagpur Khilafat Conference Mahatma Gandhi had moved a resolution which was seconded by me that his Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan should not make a treaty with that Government with which we have non-cooperated; on the other hand he should make a treaty with the Hindus and the Mahommedans of India so that we may pass our days in peace in one another's neighbourhood. We are not allowed to know the events of the Frontier and neither any Hindu nor Mahommedan leader is allowed to go there. Today the western sky appears dirty which cannot be cleared by the threatenings and the ultimatums. These things have been done thousands times and thousands of rupees have been wasted and the lives of thousands of the Hindus and the Mahommedans are destroyed for nothing.

Now another method should be adopted. I am quite sure that if a commission would be appointed, if Mahatma Gandhi, Deshbandhu Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Lala Lajpat Rai, Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Ansari, and Mohammed Ali and such other leaders go there, they would settle the matter very nicely. I am quite sure that his Majesty Amir Amanullah Khan and his subjects would try to establish friendly relations with their neighbour. Even today every little child of Afghanistan knows the name of and respects the great leader of India, Mahatma Gandhi. Would that the Government take advantage of this? We Mahommedans have explicit religious laws as well as the Fatwa of Ulemas. We Mahommedans never care for life in the preservation of Islam and in the execution of its duties. I inform the Government in plain words that if they fight with our neighbour quite contrary to our wish, then they alone would be responsible for it India would never help them in this tyrannical act. England should spend her money if she is going to fight with Afghanistan.

TIME FOR WORK

The present was the time for work. God, His angels, and the prophets were looking at them. Their beloved Prophet, seeing the sacrilege of the Holy Places and their helpless but brave attitude, was praying that the great God might give us the victory—such victory as would preserve the prestige of Sultan Abdul Majid Khan—may God perpetuate his country and his greatness—and having united the whole Islamic world at one common centre of the Khilafat Muslims might keep the Holy Places and the Religion safe and free from all impure and heretic influences.

Since he came out of the jail, he had been touring, inspecting very minutely the work of the Khilafat Committees. He found the bonds loosened but the links yet remained. He would tell the able workers of India that it was not the time for thinking, but in the words of the poet

'To part with the beloved or to part with the heart.

'I am now thinking what to do.

'Stand up and make a brave dash for the last effort.

'How the intoxicated one is going towards the place of killing.

'Just see the attitude of the lover who has trifled with his life.'

He had every hope that in a few weeks the resolution and the schemes of of the work which would be presented to them, would change the situation. An army of workers in the name of God would be formed. Hearing the voice of a weak, humble brother, the heart of every true Mahommedan would be affected and he would shout out :

'Anyone should see whether it is the same wretched Dagh.

'The bewailing of someone is making me restless.'

ALLOWANCE TO WORKERS

The President said that he considered it his duty to inform them of his ideas regarding a certain matters. Before his eyes there were many workers who had denied themselves all the pleasures of the life and had spent all that they had for the cause. Now they were in great distress and wanted to retire. These men having given their whole time to the Khilafat movement did not want to accept low reward wherewith they might support their family. They had given thousands of rupees but did not want to take any back. He was sorry to say that the very thing on account of which they wanted to retire and which they hesitated to take from the Khilafat Fund was attributed to them by some of the workers, the result of that was that those able workers were leaving the Khilafat movement. In the words of Ghalib :

'See, he is also saying that I am shameless and notorious.

'Had I been aware of this I would not have given away the effects of my house.'

He would not approve of that attitude but would ask them to remedy that defect. It was quite true that whenever any great movement was started many men of bad principles and weak ideas join it. Sometimes loss of money had also been incurred, but those inevitable things had to be faced, without stopping the work. Should they then close the shop of Islam simply because of some difficulties, or of some mistakes which had been exaggerated by their enemies for the detriment of their work. Should they compel the true soldiers of Islam to withdraw from the battlefield by annoying them. In his opinion the time had come when their leaders should come forward and set an example for others so that an army of soldiers might spring up.

He hoped they would excuse him if he said with pride that from the very first day to the time of his going to jail he had not spent more than rupees two thousand five hundred, which he could gather in one day's tour or in a few minutes in Bombay without any effort. He hoped that the Conference would think over it and wouid make some suitable arrangement for the maintenance

of workers in distress. Then he paid a tribute to Maulana Hasrat Mohani and said that whenever he saw the condition of Khilafat Committees, his memory came crowding upon him. He was the bravest among us and ten years ahead of us. Today he was happy in Yeravada jail and might be saying to himself :

'They are killing me for the crime of your love and so there is a great noise.

'You should also come to your roof to see this pleasant sight.'

The torture to which the Government had put Hasrat Mohani and his other friends could produce no effect upon them. His poetry was a lesson for them :

'How can we create a taste like ours in others.

'We are more tired of the disinterestedness of our companions.

'Our goal is not very far away.

'But not when we left behind our caravan.'

And for them he says :

'The highest degree of despair is also the beginning of love.

'We came again to the place whence we started.'

The Central Khilafat Committee should take in its hand the management of all those committees which had become weak and supply the workers where needed. Some of his friends had given word to take an active part in the movement. May God crown their efforts with success.

KHILAFAT DEPUTATION

As regards the Khilafat, they had asked the Government for passports for the deputations which they were sending to Constantinople, Angora, Hedjaz, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria, and other Islamic countries. The Government of India had enquired the names of members of the deputations and the routes of their journey which should be sent shortly. They could arrive at a true knowledge of conditions regarding the Khalifa only whent he deputations returned. He did not want to attack the personality of His Highness the Aga Khan or Mr. Syed Ameer Ali. Those two men had great love for Islam and were serving it in their own ways. Service to Islam was not reserved for any sect. Nevertheless they should keep in mind that one thing which His Highness has told Syed Wazir Hussain, late Secretary of the Muslim League, and Mohammed Ali. Its purport was—'I cannot serve the religion, the country, and the nation so much as you, or your brother or Mr. Gokhale is doing. These men have no other work save this. You should expect only so much help from me as the Englishmen give to their country.'

That was His Highness' frank statement. Taking it into consideration he would tell His Highness that he being far away from India and not know-

ing thoroughly the feelings of Indian Muslims it was not proper to give opinion on any intricate problem, even though that opinion might be a right opinion.

The Khilafat Deputation, in the capacity of the representative of the whole of India, would wait upon Khalifat-ul-Mussulmin, servant of Harmain Sharifain—may God perpetuate his Kingdom, and increase his prestige—and also upon Saiful Islam Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, as well as upon the brav^ Turks whose courage, perseverance, bravery, and ability saved Islam from a great danger.

I have every hope that one day we would be able to strengthen the Turkish Empire, the Holy Places and Islam and so I request you not to make haste in this matter. Follow your own way in India with patience and courage and form an opinion only when you have the true knowledge of the affairs.

Fortunately, at this time, God has created some notable personages in the Islamic world. Among these the names of the Khilafat-ul-Mussulmin, servant of the Harmain Sharifain, Sultan Abdul Majid Khan, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, and His Majesty Amanullah Khan are very remarkable. From the words which the Khilafat-ul-Mussulmin has uttered it follows that even in this hard time, God has created a man in the Usmania family who would not only face all these obstacles, but also would surmount them and thereby not only save the prestige of the Khilafat but also enhance it.

God willing, our deputations would wait upon Aziz of Hedjaz, Sharifa of Mecca, and Amir Faisul and would make some satisfatory settlement with them. I, as the representative of the whole of India, say that the love which the Mahommedans of the world have for the Arabs and Arabia cannot be cherished for any other nation of the world. The land where God has built His House, the land where our beloved Prophet began his Mission, the Holy Land where his sacred body is interred must be naturally loved by the Mahommedans. Our lives for the Turks is due to the fact that when the Arabs and other races became weak they erected an iron wall of their blood and flesh between Islam and infidelity and checked the fast approaching waves of the shoals of infidelity with the wall of their breasts and saved the religion. Still our love for the Turks is far less than that for the Arabs. We now assure our Arab brothers that we cannot see them in the position of slaves even for a moment. The Holy Places, Jazirat-ul-Arab, and the Hedjaz are not their property but of all the Mahommedans of the world. We assure the Arabs that once the defects and groundless rumours are removed we would render them such a good service that the ray of Islam coming out of its fountain-head of guidance would illuminate the whole world. We hear that our Arab brothers are quite ignorant of religion and the worldly affairs, and that their moral condition is hopelessly bad. Quarrelling is a common thing among them. They have become greedy of money, power, good clothes, and luscious food. Hearing all this we cannot but weep for them that the race which had taught to the world the lesson of self-sacrifice, which had given the life and

wealth for Islam has now so much degenerated.

We hope that our Arab brothers would not misinterpret our efforts for the establishment of peace; but, on the other hand, making full use of the self-sacrifice of Siddiq, courage and magnanimity of Faruq, contentment of Usman, and self-satisfiedness and valour of Haider would try to make our efforts successful. They should also not remain behind any Mahommedan race of the world in the preservation of the prestige of the Khilafat and in assisting the Khilafat-ul-Rasool. May God crown our efforts with success so that we may see again the whole world illuminated with the ray of Islam.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

I consider it my duty to give you my views about the Hindu-Muslim unity. Today we see that efforts are being made to disunite them, to destroy the Indian atmosphere in which we catch the glimpses of Swaraj and liberty. No doubt those men are first class fools who for the prejudice of the few blame all and give this trifling thing undue importance. It is quite true that the untimely movement of Shuddhi and Sanghatan has created such doubts and difficulties as may break the bonds of union between the Hindus and the Mahommedans. The enemies of the country and liberty took advantage of this and fanned this fire to such an extent that the weak-minded people of both the communities aggravated the malady still more. There was also another cause, viz., that even the Khilafat and the Congress worker began to fight and quarrel on trivial matters. The selfish entities in order to reclaim their past honour came out by the instigation of the Anglo-Indian papers and tried to smother the genuine movement. Many Hindus and Mahommedan candidates for the membership of the Council began to sing songs of the social service they had rendered in order to defeat their rivals. All these things have besmirched the Indian political atmosphere. But, thank God, we now perceive signs of the victory of Truth and their tactics do not seem to be successful.

'The Truth has come and the Untruth is vanished away, and the Untruth is a thing that always declines.'

Even in this difficult time, our Mahommedan community is comparatively courageous. It is why I have a complaint to make against the Mahommedans —why they have lost their temper at the untimely movement of Shuddhi. Our Arya brothers are defending their religion for a long time, and the Shuddhi is also going on. It is the duty of every man to preserve and preach his faith and religion. Our complaint is that it was not the proper time for giving momentum to this movement. It is the time for uniting together in order to face our common enemy with full force and put off our private affairs for settling at some other time. Nevertheless, even if it happened, the Mahommedans should not make so much noise and agitation. The Jamiat-ul-Ulema which comprises Ulema of every school of thought was existing. They would have called a meeting and would have sent a sufficient number of workers to check all this. It is quite true that just like other Anjumans it has also

become weak. However, it was not becoming of the Mahommedans to quarrel in the way they have done. Preaching of Islam is the duty of every Mahommedan. It is our ardent desire to roam in jungles, barren places, and deserts of the world and among the savages whose hearts we may illuminate with the light of Islam. But this would be done when we are not confronted with anxiety and care. I shall very politely ask all the preaching Jamiats that they should not continue with this noble work their individual aims and, having removed all the differences of opinion, they should prepare such a scheme that the work may be carried on nicely. They should also not make use of vituperation while discussing any religious question with the non-Mahommedans. Some of our brothers are so much terrified with this Shuddhi that they even go so far as to advise the giving up of the work of the Khilafat which is all the more important. I have neither fear nor anxiety about this Shuddhi movement that I should ask the Mahommedans to leave the sacred movement of the Khilafat and the Holy Places. Thank God, we have sufficient number of workers and contributors. All these movements may be carried on simultaneously and the aim of all is the Truth. The giving up of this movement will prove our cowardice, ficklemindedness and stupidity. Our enemies would laugh at us. We should give proof of valour, patience and perseverance, and should remain calm and quiet even in the face of the greatest obstacle. We should again gather together and each worker should search out his field of action where he should work without censuring his other co-workers.

NEED OF PATIENCE AND SELF-SACRIFICE

I still advise you to spend all your power in the formation of a group of Mahommedans. We should strengthen our position to such an extent that we may be able to face and surmount the greatest obstacle with patience. I always ask my Mahommedan brothers to set up an example of patience, courage, and self-sacrifice. Had Mahatmaji been out of the jail, he would have taught the lesson of magnanimity to the Hindus. All that I see today would never have come into existence. All this is due to our being the slaves of a foreign nation. Mahatma Gandhi had taken a leading part in establishing a remarkable union between the Hindus and the Mahommedans and all these unpleasant events which have happened in the country are due to his absence. Many selfish men came out and tried to wipe off the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and to regain their lost honour. I fervently hope that the clouds of dirt and dust would be dissipated when the sun of truth and courage will shine brightly. Mahatma Gandhi has repeatedly told you that the Hindu-Muslim unity is very essential for the freedom of India. In this connection, he never used ambiguous and equivocal words. I think it very necessary to tell you about certain events which may give you an insight into the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. We all put up at a Bungalow of a Hindu Gujarati brother at Calicut in Malabar. There his family was also residing. In the night we delivered lectures before a huge crowd, which were translated to them in the

Malabari language. After the meeting was over I was to go to my waiting place. Mahatma Gandhi asked me to wait. I went with him into a very big house where our Gujarati brothers and sisters were present—and I was the only Mahommedan among them. The Gujarati Hindus entertained us with great hospitality wherever we went. I have heard lectures and speeches of Mahatma Gandhi but the one made by him that night produced a peculiar effect upon my heart. It was perhaps the answer of the objection made by the Hindu Press. He said : 'Many Hindus say 'What has become of Gandhi'; He not only takes part in their (Mahommedans') religious work, become their guest, but also takes the Mahommedans with him and waits in the houses of the Hindus ? Is he not aware that the Mahommedans pull down the temples and kill the cows ? Hence it is really a folly to give place to the Mahommedans in the house of the Hindus.' Mahatmaji then said in a painful tone : 'Yes I like to go to their houses and wait there and I take the Mahommedans with me and wait in the houses of other Hindus.' It may be possible that in the days gone-by the Hindu women might have been disgraced and the temples were destroyed by the Mahommedans. I assure the people of this type that Gandhiji has not turned mad. Gandhiji is a true Hindu. Today he makes friendship with the Mahommedans and thereby protects his religion. Mahommedans are brave people, ready to sacrifice their life and wealth for the sake of religion. As compared with them the Hindus are weak. By living amidst them the Hindus also become brave. To help them myself and ask other Hindus to help them in their pure religious work is a social service. If the Mahommedans would succeed in having a satisfactory solution of the Khilafat problem, they would never forget the services we have rendered to them. They would have a great regard for us. The danger which the Hindus are anticipating from the Mahommedans would be averted by this help. The Hindu would no more be dishonoured, the temples would not be pulled down, and the cow-slaughter would be stopped for ever. The Mahommedans respect the Hindu women like their own. There is no deceit or trick in it. Sincere love will bring forth true reward. The two communities will live together in peace and comfort.'

The speech of Mahatmaji impressed all Hindu brethren and sisters. The effect it produced in my mind was very great. In my speech I said to my Hindu brethren that Mahatmaji had shown them his sincere heart and that it would be my duty to relate this event, word by word, to every Mahommedan gathering. I shall ask them that as brave and God-fearing people they should render double service in return for this one, and that they should never forget the brave Hindus, who as our comrades jointly faced the tyrannies and torture of the Government, gave their lives, filled the jails, and who even inspite of the recent unpleasant occurrences are ready to follow the order of their brave Mahatma.

HINDU SACRIFICE FOR MAHOMMEDAN CAUSE

Now-a-days the sulphurous gases of the 'German' War are blowing in the air, and a propaganda of envy and malignance is carried on, day and night. We see every day the fights between weak Hindus and the Mahommedans. It is my duty to inform the Mahommedans of the ardent desires of their true companion, sympathiser and co-worker. Mahommedans are not ungrateful, and are not cowards. Today the intrigues have succeeded in setting the Hindus against the Mahommedans; but we are not likely to forget those brilliant services the Hindus have rendered to us. I have before my mind's eyes the faces of thousands of the Hindu men and women, which can never go out of my mind. It would be our moral weakness if we did not thank them for their services. A very short event will serve here as a good example. In 1921, I had to take the advice of Mahatmaji regarding a certain moot point. I went to his waiting place, but he was in the bazar, busy in the collection of funds for the Gujarat Vidyapitha. I began a search for him and when I reached the Juhari Bazar through the cloth market I saw there a huge crowd of men who noticing my Khilafat car began to shout and gave me way. At last I reached near Mahatmaji with great difficulty. He was sitting in the shop of a Hindu brother who gave him for national education a cheque for Rs. 1501 and put a garland round Mahatma's neck. Having seen me, that Hindu brother became very happy, threw a garland of flowers round my neck and gave a cheque for Rs. 1501 for the Khilafat. I said to him that I had not come for the collection of funds; but he said that he would contribute for the Khilafat also. The same thing happened in the second and the third shop *i.e.*, the amount which was given to Mahatmaji was also given to me. We got each seven hundred rupees from the second shop and Rs. 151 from the third. Besides I got for the Khilafat Fund three thousand rupees more. Hence while we hear the petty complaints against the Hindus we should not forget such encouraging events. It is within my knowledge that the Mahommedans have also helped the Hindus in similar ways on different occasions. Both these communities should never let these events go into the limbo of obligion. On account of the death of Lokamanya Tilak the 1st of August 1920 was a Hartal day. All shops and the mills of Bombay were closed. Hundreds of groups of men were singing and going at Chopati near the sea. The heads of all these men were bare. A Pathan was also going with them with his cap on. Some workmen of the mill said to him in a harsh tone, 'put off your cap, it is the day of mourning.' He said, 'I am also mourning for Tilak Maharaj, but on these occasions we do not put off our caps.' Whereupon one of the workmen hit him with a stick and he got a long, deep wound in his head. He began to laugh and smile. The police men said to him : 'Make a report in the police station so that this man may be arrested.' But he said, 'He is my brother and today has turned mad. I will never make a report of him in your Police station.' The next day he came to me by the Khilafat motor, and showed me his wound and related the whole story. I took

him in my motor to Mahatmaji and said to him with a smile. 'See my Mahommedan has got victory over your Hindus,' and related to him the whole story. Mahatmaji became very happy to see such a sincere regard and true self-sacrifice and began to say, 'It is quite true that you Mahommedans have won.'

REFRAIN FROM UNDUE CRITICISM

Both these communities of India should have to make hundreds of similar sacrifices and have to refrain from censure and undue criticism. At last we have to mention the good things along with the bad ones.

We have now before us many stupendous affairs to be settled. Unfortunately, we cannot settle them so long as we do not attain Swaraj, so long as the halter of slavery is round our necks. The Hindus and the Mahommedans fight for trivial things and thereby strengthen all the more the chains of slavery so that they may never get freedom from it. The most important of all these is the problem of cow-slaughter. We know full well the feeling of the Hindus, but the truth is that we are quite helpless in fully solving the problem. When the revenue of the land will be in our hands, we would stop the cow-slaughter and increase the number of goats by spending one or two crores of rupees so that the goat flesh may become cheap and common. In this connection, I shall ask my Hindu brethren that just as they remained patient for a long time so also may they remain a little time more. God will make a better arrangement. It cannot be decided by disputes and fights.

For the information of my Mahommedan brethren I have told them about the speech of Mahatma Gandhi at Calicut. Now with your permission I want to tell my Hindu brethren for their information about my own speech at Randir. Mahatma Gandhi was with me and both of us had given speeches. The zealous youths of Randir had given us welcome in their cricket pavilion. The President of the meeting had lived with Mahatmaji in Africa. At the close of the meeting he said in a joke : 'I know that Mahatma is a believer in God, and it is our wish that God may make him a perfect Mahommedan.' I and several other Mahommedans did not like this. Mahatma remained quiet but I stood up and expressed before them the sincere feelings of a true Mahommedan. I said to him : 'The best thing among the Mahommedans to embrace Islam we should give proof of our being true followers – of Islam from the concrete instances of life. I now ask the President and all of you whether we Mahommedans have proved ourselves to be true followers of Islam to this Christian English Government, our Hindu brethren, or to the men of other religions. Have we not cut away the very root of Islam for the paltry gain ? Are there not thousands of Mahommedans who are proud of their service to the enemies of Islam and give proof of their meanness? How many Mahommedans are there who have sacrificed everything for the Khilafat? Before we invite any non-Muslim to embrace Islam, we should first of all make our-

selves true Mahommedans and give proof of our religious fervour and strength of faith. And then thousands of men would embrace Islam without our giving any invitation to them.'

I related a story which was told to me by a flatterer of the Government and the servant of the Political Department. He was sent to Japan as a Government spy in order to get the trace of Maulvi Barkat Ullah and his companions and to find out their activities. He went also to Count Okuma, a Japanese Minister who treated him very kindly and heard patiently all his words. This man was a fluent speaker. He said : 'We, the Mahommedans of India, have an ardent desire that the whole of Japan would become Mahommedan.' The Minister asked him : 'What is the state of Islam in India ?' He replied, 'The condition of the Indian Mahommedans is hoplessly bad. They have no education, follow no trade, their morals are depraved, and everything is defective and bad. May God do good to the British Government which has given us comfort, saved us from bloodshed and made every arrangement for our safety and comfort. It has prepared for us many means of progress and prosperity, e g., bridges, telegraphs, etc.' When he asked about the Arabs he said : 'They are almost savages. They have no education, no art and have all the defects of the world in them. They are very greedy persons and as compared with the Mahommedans of India they are no men at all.' He then asked him about the state of the Turks and got this answer from him : 'Their condition is hopelessly bad. They have no management. Bribery is rife, and the Turks are full of defects.' When he began to speak against Persia and Afghanistan, he did not leave even a single rag on their body wherewith, they may cover their naked bodies. After all this, he said, that it was his great wish that God would bring all these countries under the sway of the British rule so that the inhabitants of these countries might pass their lives in peace and comfort, and forty crores of Mahommedans would live in peace and happiness.' Count Okuma heard all this very patiently. When his shameless story was over he said to him in an angry tone : 'Are you not ashmed of asking me to embrace a religion which is full of germs of slavery? No matter whether the Mahommedans are forty crores in number still, of whatever country they may be, whether of Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan or India, they are shameless and degraded. Though we are less in number, yet we have saved our freedom by fighting with those who are four times as powerful. Do you want me to give place in my country to such a religion, the teaching of which makes men slaves and nothing else? All the nations of India, Persia, Afghanistan etc., cannot be weak and cowardly; hence it appears that it is the religion which teaches slavery. It is also due to Islam that the whole country is in a bad condition. Please go away. I do not want to hear such nonsense.'

It is merely to make the Islam infamous that we may now ask Mahatma Gandhi, Hindu brethren, and other communities to embrace it; because we have deviated from the right path of Islam and so are not presenting the

truly beautiful picture of Islam before the world.

Dear friends, do you know the aim of all this utterance of mine? May God give us courage, perseverance and His help so that we may sacrifice our lives for religion and be reduced to nothingness, and thereby, having given the proof of self-sacrifice, we may attain a new life. May we become true Mahommedans, and then everything is easy. All the obstacles and difficulties would vanish.

'A thousand days of grief and difficulty we have passed,
'Once the fortune bent in our favour, we then have everything.'

We cannot attain our aim by chattering, boasting and bragging. The world would not listen to us so long as we do not sacrifice ourselves for the attainment of our much-desired goal.

It is on account of the Great War and these calamities that our lives become pleasant, and that with all our sins we begin to love Islam. A new light has dawned upon our hearts. How true is it :

'In love the pleasures I got are known to me alone.
'I have also endured griefs which are known to me alone.
'My both eyes grew tired in the Haram and Dar.
'I have seen so many sights which I know alone.'

Dear friends, Do not lose courage. Our destination is very near. There is no loss in this business. Do not be tired of the present difficulties.

'Griefs and sorrows would decrease in two or four days.
'This time would also pass away in two or four days.'

I want to tell those Mahommedan brethren of mine who to please the enemies of Islam utter heart-wounding words, censure us and wish all the time for the destruction of this work, that they can do us no harm, and that this attitude of their towards us would make them notorious and simple. If they are unable to do anything, it would be much better for them to remain quiet. We are the mad intoxicated persons of Islam and so do not care at all for your abuses and censures.

'They are giving me lacs of abuses.
'The interest-takers are taking interest.'

WORK WITH COURAGE

As to our brave experienced workers who are found in every part of India, I shall ask them to rely on God, and take the work of the Khilafat Committees in their hands. Begin the work with courage and every step you take must be a forward one. You will then see thousands of men responding to your calls.

'When the noise of resurrection would arise from your street.
'Even from now lacs of people are ready to hear it.'

I do not lose hope even for a moment. You may complain against the Central Khilafat Committee. You may find mistakes in our work. Your quarrelling with us and refusing to help us today do not make us hopeless. We shall ask you in this way; for we take interest in obtaining in this way. I have every hope from God that in spite of the unpleasant events of one and a half or two years, success is near.

'The bewailing of the nightingale has produced its effect.
'Take the hand, for the fowler's foot loses ground.'

It is my belief that if you and I trusting in God, gather together and work for three or four months with our full force, our efforts would surely succeed this time, and victory would run with its own legs to us.

'They are coming under the pretext of a visit on I'd.
'The prayer of the night of disunion has shown this day.'

Now what should I say more ? I like a Couplet of Akbar and with that I am finishing my story :

'Thou may remain on your own way but condemn not the nature.
'Give liberty to the legs of the sight, enchain the self-conceit.
'Though thine work may remain limited and be for thine own aim.
'Take memory as your companion. Don't shut the effective door of Nature on it.
'Rise inwardly, check bewailing, take work of the tongue from the sight.
'Put your heart in zeal, don't complain, show the effect, don't make any speech.
'Mix in the dust, and burn in the fire. When the brick is formed, the work would continue.
'Don't lay the foundation and don't build on the element of these weak-hearted (people).'

SECOND DAY'S SITTING

RESOLUTIONS

On the Khilafat Conference re-assembling on the second day Maulana Shaukat Ali, President, put a resolution expressing allegiance to the Khalifa and praying for the prosperity of Islam under him. The resolution was passed by all standing, amidst shouts of Allah-o-Akbar.

TALES OF MOPLAH SUFFERING

The President next moved a resolution for the provision for Moplah orphans and families. He said the Moplahs' fight was with the Government, which had oppressed them. Thousands of Moplahs had been martyred but they owed a duty, both on religious and humanitarian grounds to these brave Muslims. While conceding that some Hindus had suffered at the hands of the Moplahs, he said the whole chapter was a closed book to them; but they had

a duty to these brave men, and he announced that he and his brother would each provide for the maintenance of one Moplah orphan.

M. Abdur Rahman, a Moplah, addressing the Conference alleged that Government had given out only a propagandist version and had painted the Moplahs in the worst colour. He had come to appeal to the Conference to help thousands of distressed families and urge the Congress Committee to enquire into the Moplah affairs.

Dr. Mahmud said, that when he went to Malabar to make an enquiry he had hardly begun it when a Government order prohibited him. Although he was ready to disobey that order, and the brave Moplahs despite their unspeakable distress had asked him to disobey the order, he would have done so but for an order of the Congress and Khilafat Committees to return; still he had collected enough materials and he could soon publish his report based on the statement of Hindu witnesses leaving aside the evidence of the Muslims.

He gave an instance of a mosque in a Moplah village bearing desecration, the result of gun shots. He was told by the Hindus of the village that the Moplah women there were shot without reason and these atrocities occurred in a village which was not rebellious. He thought that the Moplah martyrs numbered far above ten thousand and the orphans and the helpless numbered still more. He hoped such a committee would soon be sent to the Moplah's country to bring to light the atrocities committed on the Moplahs.

The resolution was passed and funds were collected for the maintenance of the orphans. A number of Khilafat leaders, including Dr. Kitchlew, Dr. Ansari and others, and Begum Mahommed Ali agreed to pay for the maintenance of one Moplah orphan each.

THIRD DAY'S SITTING

Cocanada, 30 December 1923

The Khilafat Conference held its third sitting on the 30th, the important feature of which was the speech of Mr. Mahommed Ali regarding the Khilafat funds and his justification not only for the continuance of Khilafat Committees but to strengthen them by re-organisation and appointment of paid workers who would devote their full energies to the Khilafat work.

RESOLUTIONS

Maulana Abdul Majid of Badaun moved :

'This session of the Khilafat Conference declares that the Khalifat demands of the Mussulmans were the following : (1) Complete freedom of the Turkish Empire, (2) Restitution of Thrace, (3) Restitution of Smyrna and the coast of Asia Minor, (4) Freedom and safeguard of Jazirat-ul-Arab.

'This conference recognises that the treaty of Lausanne has brought about the decision of the first three demands but the question of freedom and safe-

guarding of Jazirat-ul-Arab, which from the religious point of view of the Mussulmans is the most important clause of the Khilafat demands, remains unaltered.

'This Conference, in clear terms and for the last time, declares that unless all provinces in Arabia are freed and are safe in the true sense the Islamic world will not rest in peace and shall continue the struggle with all its might.'

Mr. Abdur Rahman seconding said : If Islam was to be safe its heart, Jazirat-ul-Arab, must be free from foreign control. While they would leave it to their Deputations to settle the position of Khilafat they stood for the freedom of Jazirat-ul-Arab under the Khilafat control. He drew attention towards the Akalis who, though a handful of men compared with forty crores of Mussulmans, were sacrificing themselves to keep their Gurudwaras under their own management and these handful of men had won many victories against Government.

Mr. C.R. Das advanced to the rostrum amidst the shouts of Alla-o-Akbar. He held out his support for this 'resolution'. He addressed the gathering as 'comrades in the work of freedom and in the cause of Khilafat and in the Congress.' His reason for supporting the motion was that he was a Hindu and because Hinduism enjoined 'when the religion of your brother is oppressed by anybody it is your duty to extend your helping hand.' Mr. C.R. Das mentioned that he was the first person to have urged the Congress to take up the Khilafat at Delhi in 1918. Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, the President, then ruled it out, but the next year, the Amritsar Congress took it up. He assured the Conference that whenever their religion was attacked, true Hindus would always march with them. (Hear, hear). 'There are good men and bad men amongst the Hindus as there are good and bad amongst the Mahommedans. But let not the badness of a bad man deter you from the good cause. If the cause is good it will secure the support of all good Hindus. It is good Mahommedans and good Hindus who will carry your struggle to a successful issue' (cries of Allah-o-Akbar.)

Mr. Barucha counselled the government to give up their present move and concede first the Muslim demands. He assured all communities' support as regards the Frontier. He said, while individually the offenders should be punished, no war with Afghanistan would be tolerated. In case of such war the Indians would not stand by the Government (applause).

The resolution was passed.

THE FOREMOST ISLAMIC DUTY

Mr. Yakub Hussain moved : 'This meeting of the Khilafat Conference reaffirms its previous demands and declares on behalf of the Mussulmans that the attainment of free and national Government is not only a political and national, but the foremost Islamic duty. This Conference reminds the Mussulmans of India that in the path of courage and freedom to suffer is their Islamic

inheritance. It is therefore the duty of the Mussulmans in this struggle for Swaraj that they should not only work shoulder to shoulder with their country-brethren but try to set an example in being ahead of their companions and remain firm in their untiring zeal and energy.'

Syed Hussain Ahmed, President of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and Mr. Ahmed Sait supported. They pointed out that the Indians were slaves and provided a reserve for the British to enslave other communities. If, therefore, the Muslims of India wanted to save the neighbouring Moslem countries from troubles in future, they must make India free and deprive England of using Indian resources to enslave other countries. The resolution was adopted.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad next moved a resolution pledging the Hindu-Muslim unity and calling upon the community to safeguard the places of worship of all communities, to show tolerance and stand against the rioters to whatever community they might belong. Maulana Azad said that leaving aside the relations between the Hindus and the Mussulmans under the Mahommedan rulers, they know that for the last 150 years of the British rule up till 1920, not only the two communities were not united but the British had done everything to keep them apart. Up till 1920 not a minute was spent to bring the two communities together. In 1920 their first effort was made. After three years their relations had again been strained, and he heard people declaring on that ground that the Hindu-Muslim unity was impossible to achieve. This counsel of despair was absolutely baseless and took no account of human nature. If the communities ever quarrelled, it sometimes took them five, or seven or fifty years to make up. That was human nature. Would they therefore, declare that the relations between 21 crores of Hindus and seven crores of Mahommedans which had remained strained for ages will remain so far ever ? Would they pass their judgment if after three years' experience some stray instances of conflict had occurred ? If they did that they took no note of human nature. The time for passing judgment on Hindu-Muslim unity would come when they had worked for it for some years and even some decades. The riots that had occurred were deplorable and his resolution was intended to emphasise their obligation to attain unity.

The resolution was passed.

KHILAFAT FUND

Mr. Mahommed Ali next moved a resolution—

(1) Entrusting their Working Committee with the work of re-organisation of the Khilafat Committees.

(2) Appealing for funds both in lump-sum and regular monthly and annual donations to carry on the struggle for freedom of Jazirat-ul-Arab and of India.

(3) To organise Khilafat Volunteers under the Central Khilafat Com-

mittee which would co-operate with the Congress volunteers at length.

He said that the enemies' propaganda had been used to urge that after the Lausanne Treaty the Khilafat Committee must be closed. The Lausanne treaty gave the Turks their Swaraj but the question of Khalifat was as unsolved as ever. The Turks and the Muslims all over the world had to settle the question of Khilafat. The real Khilafat issue of freeing the Jazirat-ul-Arab from foreign control in obedience to the last will of their Prophet was before them. Thus, the need of Khilafat organisation today was more than ever before, and the real Khilafat issue was now before them. Mahommedans of India had first to decide whether they had any love for their Prophet's injunctions or not. If they had, their duty was clear. He admitted that Khilafat funds had not been well-managed but his wonder was that considering the strenuous struggle they were engaged in—when no one knew whether he would be inside the jail or out—his wonder was that the funds had not been more badly managed. Was this peculiar to them, he asked ? During the War this Government with its vast machinery could not prevent huge frauds. Once, five thousand razors were not at all supplied, although no less than twenty-two big officers had signed that it had been delivered. Again, a contractor was paid eight times a bill for khaki uniforms without supplying them once. If, therefore, during War such callous waste and mis-management had occurred even under the Government what wonder was there that during the Khilafat struggle when workers were changing almost hourly such mismanagement had occurred ? Some had said, why was the Khilafat fund kept with Seth Chhotani and why not in a Bank ? Why should Seth Chhotani have used it for his purpose ? He must say that Seth Chhotani was one of the finest men who subscribed to the Khilafat fund. They did not put the fund in a Bank because they might have been deprived of it, and what was there to prevent a Bank to close just as the Alliance Bank went into liquidation ? He further pointed out that Banks also use for other purposes money deposited with them. They however hoped to realise from Seth Chhotani or from his mills the money he owed to the committee. But even if all the sixteen lakhs were lost, would they refuse to give any more money for freeing their Holy Places ? Supposing he had sent two hundred rupees towards the doctor's bill because of the illness of his daughter, and if that money was lost by the messenger carrying it to her, he would send the money again if he had love for his daughter. That was what they had to keep in view. If they loved their Prophet they must give funds for that purpose. He was sure that better management would be achieved in future. They must also make up their mind that if they wanted the Khilafat struggle to be brought to a successful issue, they must have workers and pay them living wages out of the Khilafat funds and must look after their families when they went to jails. As for himself and his brother, they had been called robbers by the 'Times of India.' The Britishers came as traders to India and if he was

a robber, he was following the footsteps of his King's Government but he wanted to point out that his family was being maintained by a lover of Khilafat. Their khaddar clothes did not cost much and their home, built ages ago by their grandfather, was falling into decay while others with them had built big bungalows. What were he and his brother then doing with money ? Were they digging it underground ? He had love for his Prophet and had given himself to God's cause. If they did not trust him, they could appoint another man, but if they had love for the cause and wanted workers, they must give bare living to those who led and participated in the campaign of sacrifice.

As a result of this speech money was subscribed liberally to the Khilafat fund.

Dr. Kitchlew said that the Akalis were fighting for the resolution of the Maharaja of Nabha, because one of their Gurus had told an ancestor of the Maharaja that the Maharaja's home was also the Guru's home. To fulfil that pledge of the Guru, the Akalis were standing to every man to restore the Maharaja to his Gaddi. Must not the Mahommedans do the same to carry out the last will of no less an authority than their Prophet? He pointed out that the Arya Samaj was keeping paid workers to propagate its mission. Similarly the Khilafat workers should be appointed.

The resolution was then adopted.

FOURTH DAY'S SITTING

Cocanada, 1 January 1924

The Khilafat Conference concluded its session an January 1, late in the night. Some of the most important resolutions of this session were passed on this day. The following are important resolutions :

INDIAN NATIONAL PACT

This meeting of the Khilafat Conference accepts the following fundamental principles of the Indian National Pact and the Bengal Pact :

(1) Representation on the basis of population.

(2) Protection of the rights of minorities.

(3) Toleration between the different communities of India, and

(4) Full religious and communal freedom.

It is resolved that the Khilafat Committees all over India and other Islamic institutions should give their full consideration to both the Pacts and should forward their suggestions on the details of the Indian National Pact through the Provincial Khilafat Committees to the under mentioned Sub-Committee appointed for the purpose, and which will submit their report to the Central Khilafat Committee by the 31 March 1924—(1) Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, (2) Maulana Abul Sabir Sahib, (3) T.A.K. Sherwani, and (4) Shaib Qureshi (Convener).

FREEDOM OF JAZIRAT-UL-ARAB

This Conference reiterates its former decisions and lays down in the clearest terms the demands of the Indian Mussulmans regarding Arabia and the Arabs. It declares on behalf of the Mussulmans of India that they do not for a moment desire the people of Jazirat-ul-Arab to be under any foreign Government even if it be that of a Muslim Power. The freedom of the Arabs, their advancement and national honour is much dearer to the Mussulmans of India than of other Islamic countries. The purpose of the present struggle is therefore to make the Arabs free and safe from foreign control and domination, and that while maintaining their internal freedom the Arabs should keep themselves bound up with the Central Islamic Khilafat according to the National and religious tenets of Islam. It is however essential that Harmain-i-Sharifain should be under the direct control of Khilafat-ul-Muslimin for, according to Islamic Shariat, the control and management of pilgrimage is the sole right of Khalifa-ul-Muslimin alone.

SWARAJ —AN ISLAMIC DUTY

This meeting reaffirms its previous demands and declares on behalf of Mussulmans that the attainment of free and national Government is not only a political and national but a foremost Islamic duty. This Conference reminds the Mussulmans of India that to suffer in the path of courage and freedom is their Islamic inheritance. It is therefore the duty of Mussulmans that in the struggle for Swaraj they should not only work shoulder to shoulder with their countrymen and brethren but try to set an example in being ahead of them and remain firm in their untiring zeal and energy.

MUSLIM NATIONAL EDUCATION

Another resolution called upon Indian Mussulmans to give their immediate and serious attention to all national educational institutions generally and particularly the National Muslim University of Aligarh. If the Mussulmans of India did not give their full and generous help, both moral and monetary, then not only would the existence of the present national institution be imperilled but also the aim of national education would be jeopardised for a long time.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. II, 1923.

59

FIFTH SESSION OF THE JAMIAT-UL-ULEMA CONFERENCE

Cocanada, 29 December 1923

The fifth session of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema opened at 9 p. m. on the 29th December. The meeting continued till 1-30 a.m. Maulvi Mahommed Umar Karnauli, Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcomed the delegates. In supporting the motion of election of Maulvi Syed Hussain Ahmed as President, Maulvi Badauni declared that the Jamiat-ul-Ulema was a most competent body to speak on behalf of Muslims and to lead them. He declared that when Sir Syed Ahmed started the Aligarh College the Ulemas opposed him because they believed that the College would do no good but much harm. The justification of the Ulemas' views who at the time were considered as reactionaries was when the very students (the Ali Brothers) who had loved that institution most took up their cudgels to break it. He declared it to be the religious duty of the Muslims to side with other communities to win freedom.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Maulvi Syed Hussain Ahmed who was one of the five who were tried at Karachi along with the Ali Brothers over the Ulemas fatwa delivered a lengthy presidental address in Urdu. He first dwelt on the relation between Islam and Europe and England, and narrated how the European countries had, whenever and wherever possible, been attacking Islam depriving the Muslim countries of their possession, destroying their power and, besides all these using their propaganda activities to prove to the world that the Muslims were uncivilised while they themselves were committing every uncivilised act and enslaving the Muslims. Among all European countries England, he alleged, was the worst enemy of Islam. At Sevres the Allied Powers had buried Islam and it was only Mustafa Kemal who had frustrated the evil designs of the enemies. He further declared that Turkey was left with no alternative during the war except to join the Germans, and that another proof of British insincerity was that while they held out big promises to the Arabs and used them to crush Turkey they had now broken all those promises and enslaved them. The attitude of the British towards the Muslims in India was no better. The British, he declared, destroyed Indian trade, killed her industries and introduced a system of education injurious to India. Railways, telegraphs and other systems were introduced not to benefit India but to further strengthen their hold on India and to exploit her more and more. Indians were employed in the army only as soldiers although the officers' ranks were kept open to them.

The President further attacked the Western civilisation which the Britishers had introduced in India with all its accompaniments of degrading morals by allowing gambling, cinematograph and theatrical performances, liquor consumption, etc. In fact, as was proved by the Karachi trial, the English Codes of Law in India were opposed to the commandments of God. The cause of all this degeneration of India and Islam was the British policy. The first and foremost duty of Muslims was to stand against the Government. The second duty in importance was to rid the Holy Places and Jazirat-ul-Arab of foreign control. The third duty of the Muslims of India was to work for the freedom of India, both for political and religious,—religious because unless India was free, her voice of protest against injustice on other Muslim countries would not be effective and the Muslims of India, if they felt called upon to help their Muslim brethren outside India, either in form of money, men or weapons, they could not do so until India was free and England would not be able to do any more mischief to Islam.

WINNING OF SWARAJ--A RELIGIOUS DUTY

It was therefore, the religious duty of the Muslims to win Swaraj for India. Moreover, as a result of exploitation of India, a number of Muslims had become very poor and were embracing other religions which they would not have done otherwise. For political considerations also Swaraj was as essential for Muslims as for any other community. Under the present tutelage they could neither improve their condition internally nor safeguard their interests outside or the interests of their countrymen abroad. Indeed, even if no other community worked for Swaraj the Mussulmans should have to work for it.

HINDU-MUSLIM ENTENTE—A RELIGIOUS NECESSITY

He said, Hindu-Muslim unity was vital. Islam enjoined reliance only on God. Even if after the attainment of Swaraj the Hindus deserted them, they need not be afraid and should only rely on God. Moreover, as Islam required every Muslim to do his utmost to overcome his enemy, the Hindu-Muslim entente which alone could enable them to do so was religiously necessary. He fully believed that though differing in faith the communities of India could remain united on the fundamental issues. The army in India consisted of soldiers of different faiths and nationalities. When the trumpet sounded they all stood together and fought together for the common purpose but as soon as they returned from the battle-field all the soldiers separated and lived a life according to their tastes and faith. What was true in the case of the army would be true in the case of India. (Applause). He emphasised that India was the motherland of the Muslims. Here they were to live and die and they must, therefore, work for Swaraj as zealously as any other community.

THE SHUDDHI MOVEMENT

Referring to the Hindu Shuddhi Movement, he said that the manner in

which that campaign had been carried on showed that its sponsors were the worst enemies of India. Carrying on of '*tabligh*' (conversion) was their duty. Conversion campaigns must keep in view that those are to be converted who really believed in that faith. The parties opposed to all conversions should keep certain points in view in order to avoid bitter feelings, for instance, no provocative words should be used in reference to the founders of the respective religions.

He also felt that considering the speeches and writings of its founders the Sangathan movement would prove detrimental to the cause of Indian advance. He hoped Congress leaders would keep aloof from these two movements as the Congress was a joint political body. He urged the Mahommedans to improve their community but this must not be done with the intention of dominating over the other communities.

KHILAFAT QUESTIONS

He said that opinion regarding Khilafat in its relation to the Turkish republic must be postponed till all the facts were known. In fact, this would be decided by a congregation of Ulemas of Islam. He repudiated the allegation made in some interested quarters that Ulemas' Fatwa declaring it impious and against religion to enter the Councils had been issued to support Gandhiji. The Congress policy, he declared, might change but the Ulemas' Fatwa could not. Their opposition against Council-entry still stood and it had now been found out that many of those who were for entering the Councils to wreck them merely wanted to go there to work them and to use them for their gains.

RESOLUTIONS

The Jamait passed the following resolutions :

ANGORA AND THE KHILAFAT

One resolution regarding the position of the Khilafat declares full faith in the Angora Government, condemns propagandist activities of the enemies of Islam to create misunderstanding about the attitude of Angora, and deplores that even some Mahommedans have allowed themselves to be used by the enemies of Islam for this purpose. The Conference asks Indian Muslims not to be disturbed because their *Shariat* can throw enough light on the question of the power and position of the Khilafat. The Jamait-ul-Ulema expresses its conviction that the Angora Government will call a fully representative body of Islamic Ulemas and leaders of all parts of the world to settle this vital question.

Maulana Ahmed Syed, speaking on this resolution, said that Angora had only recently emerged from War and was busy settling its internal affairs. The Turks had assured them that they would ascertain Muslim opinion on the

question. A republican form of Government and Khilafat were not incompatible. Quranic injunctions on the matter were quite clear and would enable a solution being reached. Mussulmans all over the world including those in India must owe allegience to the Khalifa whose authority over Indian Muslims would be as much as over the Turks and who should thus provide a link to unite Muslims all over the world.

SUPPORT TO BENGAL PACT

The resolution on the question of Pact says that between the Indian National Pact prepared by Dr. Ansari and Lala Lajpat Rai and the Bengal Pact, the latter is more equitable and more productive and helpful for the attainment of Swaraj. The Conference deplores the hostile attitude towards the Bengal Pact as it overlooks the requirements of a united nation and mutual agreement. The Conference appointed a committee to collect opinions, examine them and to report, keeping in view the principles of justice, toleration, preservation of rights and religious liberty. The Reports is to be submitted by the end of February, and after its consideration by Executive Committee of the Jamait-ul-Ulema, is to be forwarded to the Congress Sub-Committee. The Committee will consist of Maulanas Hussain Ahmed, Shabbir Ahmed, Syed Suleman, Abdul Alim, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana, Abdul Qadir and Kifaitulla.

Speaking on the resolution Maulana Abdul Majid declared that some Pact was essential to assuage doubts and give satisfactory assurance about the future relations between the two communities. Mr. Zama declared that Mahommedans who were at present hesitating to join the movement for freedom would at once throw in their lot with them if a satisfactory pact was concluded.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

MEMORIAL TO MOPLAH MARTYRS

The Conference in another resolution condemned the atrocities committed on Moplah and declared the train tragedy as the darkest page in British history in India. To perpetuate the memory of Moplah martyrs the Conference decided to raise a fitting memorial and appointed a committee for the purpose.

MUSLIM CONTROL OF HOLY PLACES

The next resolution declared that as it is essential that Jazirat-ul-Arab which included Aden should be free from non-Muslim control, Indian Muslims should work for its freedom and that as Jazirat-ul-Arab is a vital point, all eastern nations should also work to secure its freedom.

SWARAJ AND HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

The Conference also adopted a resolution declaring that as Swaraj depen-

ded on unity, both Hindus and Mahommedans should work together to bring about unity. The Conference therefore condemned those activities which are likely to weaken the basis of unity and considered their promoters as enemies of the nation.

NAGPUR MUSLIMS CONGRATULATED

Another resolution passed by the Conference deplored the excesses committed on Mahommedans at Nagpur and Jhansi and congratulated Mahommedans of those places on their patience and tolerance.

SYMPATHY FOR AKALIS

The Conference also passed a resolution sympathising with the Akalis and characterising as interference with religious liberties and inherent right the order of the Government in declaring the Gurudwara Committee as an unlawful association.

A Sikh speaker who is a member of the Gurudwara Committee thanked the Conference and assured them of the Akalis' support in their struggle.

Among other resoulutions the Conference (1) condemned the shooting at Durgah in Ajmer, (2) congratulated the Ali Brothers, Dr. Kitchlew, Maulana Hussain Ahmed and others who were tried at Karachi, (3) expressed anger at the action of Bombay Government against Maulana Hasrat Mohani and congratulated him, and (4) condemned the North Western Frontier administration in prosecuting those who took part in observing the Jazirat-ul-Arab day.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. II, 1923.

60

THE ABOLITION OF THE KHILAFAT : RESOLUTIONS AND THE PREAMBLE PASSED BY THE GREAT NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AT ANGORA

After having for centuries by ignorance and corruption brought extensive catastrophes upon the country, the Sublime Porte and the Palace are finally becoming figures of history. The Turkish nation—real possessors and founders of the Ottoman Empire revolted in Anatolia and cast itself into the struggle both against the enemy from without and against the palace and Sublime Porte who made common cause with that enemy against the nation. Having constituted the Great National Assembly its Government and army with

terrible privations and difficulties as is known the nation commenced combat, by active warfare against the exterior enemy, the Palace and the Sublime Porte; and today has reached the day of liberation. Realising the treason of the Palace and the Sublime Porte, the Turkish nation promulgated the Law of Fundamental Organisations, according to the first clause of which sovereignty is taken from the Sultan and transferred to the person of the nation. According to the second clause legislative and administrative powers are placed in its rightful hands. The seventh clause leaves to the choice of the nation the sovereign rights such as to declare War and concluded peace. Consequently from that time the former Ottoman Empire crumbled, and in its place arose a new and national Turkish Government; also from that time the Sultan is abolished and superseded by the Great National Assembly; that is to say, that the body existing in Constantinople absolutely unsupported, unconstitutional, and without national influence, except, through foreign support and strength, is moribund. In the place of Sultanate built up of the corruption of court circles and individual sovereignty, the nation has constituted popular Government, administration guaranteeing the welfare and the rights of the people themselves and the peasants. In these circumstances we find it strange that those in Constantinople who sided with the enemy should mention the rights of the Khilafat, the Sultanate and the Sovereign. Tewfik Pasha's telegram, a disgraceful, ridiculous and senseless document, has no parallel in history. The Great National Assembly has decided to proclaim and publish the following dispositions :

(1) By virtue of the Law of Fundamental organisations the representative of the Sovereign rights of Turkish people was invited in an inalienable, undivided and irrevocable manner in the moral person of the Great National Assembly, which is the sole and only emanation of the people, and has decided not to recognise any other power or body not Assembly therefore does not recognise within the frontiers defined by the National Pact any other form of Government. Consequently, it esteems that from the 16 March 1920, the form of Government existing in Constantinople based upon personal sovereignty has been relegated to the past.

(2) The Khilafat, being identified with the Ottoman Dynasty, the Great National Assembly will choose for the office of Khalifa from the Imperial family, the best educated, honest, upright and noble member. The Great National Assembly is the support of the Khilafat.

Source : **Government of India, Home Department, Political, F. No. 60, 1923.**

61

FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Lucknow, 31 March 1923

The sitting of the 15th Session of the All-India Muslim League commenced at Lucknow on 31 March 1923. The business of the day restricted to the reading to the speeches by Lt. Shaikh Shahid Hussain, the Chairman of the Reception Committee and Mr. Bhurgri the President of the League.

CHAIRMAN'S SPEECH

Lt. Shaikh Shahid Hussain in the course of his address said : 'The Khilafat question has been solved not by futile appeals, nor by costly deputations but by the trusty sword of the keepers of the Khilafat, the Turkish nation led by the glorious hero of Islam, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha, thus saving Islam from accepting the favours or being under obligations to Europe.' In regard to the transference of the Khlifat he said, 'Professor Margoliuth, in a recent publication sarcastically remarks that while during the War the Moslems were laying down the proposition that the temporal and the spiritual power must remain united according to the Shariat in the person of the Khalifa and were accusing the Allies of attempting to destroy it, after the War the National Assembly to Angora adopts the policy of dividing the temporal and the spiritual power of the Sultan Khalifa. If the news is true then the National Assembly of Angora has to justify its action according to the Shariat before the Moslem world. We are not in any way bound to accept any such measure contrary to our religious commandments. As far as I understand from the fatwa of the Moslem Jurists, the spiritual and temporal power of the Khalifa cannot be separated. There can be no second Pope in Islam. At the same time a Khalifa cannot be an autocrat. I am sure of one thing that if out of sheer disgust at the action of the ex-Sultan or owing to the necessities of diplomacy during the peace negotiations they have been misled into this action the defenders of Khilafat will soon rectify the error when it is pointed out to them by the competent Moslem authorities. It is the duty of our Ulema to make this point clear that the Shariat laws cannot be tempered. Angora National Assembly will put itself right by restoring it to the new Khalifa his rights conferred on him by the Sharia. As I said it is a domestic matter and its solution does not appear to me to be a difficult one.'

Lt. Shahid next passed on to the question of Hindu-Moslem unity. In his opinion there had been some progress in the direction of Hindu-Moslem unity for which credit was due to some selfless workers. He added, 'The soreness created in elections to various public bodies has been removed to a great extent by separate communal representation. The far-seeing policy of

the Moslem League which was so much suspected at the beginning has justified itself. In the apparent disunion we see the goal to final unity. During the transition period one ought not to be surprised if it is not all plain-sailing. This state of affairs is likely to continue till the country has advanced to a pitch when it will break these artificial bonds of its own accord. You distinguished brethren, in your wisdom will have to devote your attention for its solution. But brethren, if you agree with me then till that happy time comes the safest and the surest guarantee of the progress of the country lies in individual and communal advancement.'

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The address of Mr. Bhurgri, the President of the All-India Muslim League is a long speech in six sections beginning with a note of hope that a more or less workable Turkish peace treaty is in sight. The address is divided into two parts, one dealing with the Turkish and the Khilafat questions and the other with the internal affairs of India.

At the outset Mr. Bhurgri paid a tribute to the founders of the Khilafat Committee in India and their successors in office for the splendid services they had rendered to the cause of Islam. Reviewing the British attitude towards the Moslems in regard to the Greco-Turkish conflict he said, 'though the Mussulmans have known no peace of mind ever since the Tripolian War they have never seen darker days than during the ministry of the ex-Premier Mr. Lloyd George who had been, as he himself admitted, largely responsible for the Greek occupation of Smyrna. He could never see or learn the wisdom and necessity of stopping the butchery and devastation systematically carried on by the Greeks in Anatolia. He spurned the Moslem appeals for the better understanding with Turkey and all he could think was that 'the Mediterranean is vital to Britain; we want the friendship of the Greek people, a people whose friendship is vital to us. They will multiply and wax strong. They are a people of vital intelligence, of energy and they have shown they have courage.' In support of M. Venizelos' theory of a Greek majority in Thrace and Smyrna he did not hesitate to employ his argument of these being 'Greek Mahommedans, Mussulmans by religion, but of Greek nationality who should be linked to Greece.'

Mr. Bhurgri next mentioned how the sudden Turkish onslaught on Smyrna and Ismid gave rise to Mr. Lloyd George's memorable manifesto whereby resentment against the Mussulmans in general and the Turks in particular was sought to be created in Europe and the British Dominions. The manifesto after alluding to the possibility of 'the entire loss of the whole results of the victory over Turkey in the late War' appealed for force to guard the freedom of the straits and to prevent violent and hostile Turkish aggression.

THE DRAFT TREATY

Continuing, Mr. Bhurgri said : 'We in India hoped that with the disappearance of Mr. Lloyd George, Britain would turn a new leaf in its foreign policy towards Turkey. But the proceedings of the Lausanne Conference are not of a happy nature. It will only be to the good of England if she shows a friendly gesture to Turkey even at this eleventh hour. The draft treaty presented to the Turks is a sorry document. It has still most of the faults of the obnoxious Treaty of Sevres and the Turks cannot be expected to accept it. Though the question of boundaries has been more or less settled the capitulations, the Straits, the 'question of minorities' and the economic clauses are a stumbling block in the securing of real peace of in the Near East. The capitulations have been largely instrumental in arresting the progress and development of Turkey. Originally they were concessions made by the free will and graciousness of the Turkish sovereigns. Now, however, they have assumed a dangerous shape. Though it is declared that the capitulations are abolished in principle, yet what is substituted in their place in the draft treaty is no remedy for the miserable political and economic plight of Turkey. If in the Turkish demand for the complete abolition of the capitulations the attitude of Lord Curzon has been hostile it is not less so even with regard to the question of the Straits.

QUESTION OF THE STRAITS

Mr. Lloyd George was never tired of proclaiming the British and the world interests in the Straits of Dardanelles. And Lord Curzon too is proceeding with this question much in the same spirit. Let me at once say that no one would be against the permanent freedom of the Straits but that is a very different thing from their strategical freedom. The dismantling of the fortifications (though already completed by the Allies) and the free movement of warships between the Mediterranean and the Black Seas would be a source of permanent danger to the Black Sea States and we are not surprised at the stout opposition of Russia to such a scheme. The economic freedom of the Straits, the Turks would gladly guarantee and they have in fact throughout the entire past scrupulously avoided restricting it even in times of national danger. To say that the Straits have an international character is really confusing the issue. If the proposition were carried to its logical conclusions, every waterway big or small, has more or less an international character. After all, the English Straits of Dardanelles is of very small percentage compared to that of Rumania, Russia and other Reparian Powers.

If we pass on to the question of minorities there are many questions of the Near East all awaiting a humanitarian solution and one despairs of the prospect of permanent peace in the Near East. The salvation of these minorities lies not in floating them still further, neither in the creation of national homes for them, nor wringing out for them forced and unworkable guarantees but in advising them to live peacefully with their neighbours. So long as they do

believe that they have foreign protection even then engaged in treason against their country as they were during the last war there would be no lasting peace in Turkey and this question will always continue to drop us as did the other questions before it and which were only settled by the successive diminution of the Turkish possessions. If like us they are to have separate and communal representation in their Government, Turkey, I am sure, would not grudge granting it.'

Continuing Mr. Bhurgri said that since the days when Lord Kitchner was sent out to Egypt to preserve the neutrality of Egypt in the Turko-Italian War the foreign policy of England towards the Islamic countries was one of unsympathetic and on some well-known occasions hostile attitude. If Islamic countries are weak to-day, Britain, in spite of recent expansion of her dominions, is decidedly weaker. Her prestige and moral weight are shaken in the East as they were never shaken before. In the Middle East where English statesmen counted their greatest gain, there is the greatest loss and the entire Middle East will sooner or latter be lost to them.

BRITISH ACTIVITIES IN MESOPOTAMIA

Referring to the British activities in Mesopotamia, Mr. Bhurgri quoted Colonels Repington and Lawrence and said that the Arabs rebelled against the Turks during the war not because they wanted independence. They did not risk their lives in the battle to become British subjects or French citizens. Promises of independence were made to the Arabs though Mr. Churchill later on denied any knowledge of any promise of handing Mesopotamia back to the Arabs. 'In regard to those problems in the Near East and Arabia,' said Mr. Bhurgri. 'views of the Turks, Arabs and Indians are wholly identical. All are only interested in securing the Arabs the right of self-determination and freedom from non-Muslim control, but will England consent to it ? Speaking frankly I do not yet see any sign of it. So we Mussulmans must see these countries freed from the mandates which are crippling them and must stand by these people in their struggle.'

LEAGUE OF ORIENTAL NATIONS

Mr. Bhurgri went on to say, 'Signs are not already wanting of such a federation of States—a real League of nations—coming into being. Kabul, Tehran, and Angora have entered into a solemn pact of brotherhood. The people of the so-called mandated territories will join it. The moment they come into their own and the day Japan and China have made up their differences, they would come in the movement and be the leading nations in the struggle. Some people think the idea of a League of Oriental Nations to be a dream, but when I notice the aggression of Europe against Asia and Africa, the behaviour of the white races towards the coloured peoples and coloured prejudices in some of the Western countries, I clearly see the early realisation of this dream. Asia for the Asiatics has already gained possession of the

heart of this Continent and has Africa for the Africans and silently—it may be slowly the maker and unmaker of nations in working out His will. India's place is undoubtedly in that brotherhood and I feel confident that it will one day, by reason of her size, population and resources, have a very honoured place in it.'

In regard to the changing of the Khalifa, Mr. Bhurgri says, 'If the Angora Government ever comes to take a wrong step in religious matters, Mussulmans themselves will not allow it to go unchallenged and unconnected. But it is that the election of the Khalifa is in accordance with the best traditions of Islam and it was by election that Moslems have the best of the Khalifa. In addition to his election the present Khalifat-ul-Mussulmin enjoys his exalted office by the free consent of the entire Moslem world. The deposition and even the flight of ex-Sultan Wahiduddin would have caused no comment had it not been for the fact that at the present movement birds of the same feather would have flocked in Hedjaz and it has created an impression. I fondly hope some developments with regard to the 'Transference' of the Khilafat to ex-Sheriff Hussain may not be altogether impossible at the time of the forthcoming Haj. As the ex-Sheriff and the Ex-Khalifa are the proteges of England I would be failing in my duty if I did not utter a solemn warning against any such foolish and unpaying proceedings.

INDIAN PROBLEMS

The President next passed on to problems confronting India today. He said, 'British rule in India has worked both for good and evil and has had its due share of merits and demerits. In any case it has come to stay whether we regard it as a necessary evil or as a heavenly blessing. We cannot at present eradicate it without endangering our own existence, and let due notice be taken of this. But it is neither indelible nor eternal.' Mr. Bhurgri laid the blame for this present tension of feeling in India at the door of short-sighted British statesmen in India and in England. Criticising the policy of Government after the coming of reforms he referred to the arrest of non-cooperators and 'to the systematic persecution and torture of many of the political prisoners inside the jails and to the inhuman treatment of them as common depraved felons such as is unheard of in any other civilised country.' He had a word of praise for the U.P. Government for granting amnesty to political prisoners. Mr. Bhurgri strongly condemned the appointment of the Services Commission and next passed on to the Indianisation of the army and other Services. He said that India being a manpower country as in contrast to money-powered England, the former could not afford to imitate the latter's most expensive military organisation.

Dealing with the question of Indians abroad he said, 'our countrymen in Kenya are threatened with violence and it is high time that we should devise ways and means of properly safeguarding their interest, person and property from the depredations of the 'white-men's burden'. The root cause of the

problem however, lies in my opinion in the race-hatred of the white against the coloured or Europe versus Asia.

REMEDIES TO EVILS

Suggesting remedies to all these evils Mr. Bhurgri said, 'there are three things which the Government of India can and must do without any loss of time to achieve the desired end. These are firstly urging for the appointment now instead of after ten years as originally stipulated of the Statutory Commission to examine the working of the reformed constitution specially with reference to the following—(*a*) relation between Simla and Whitehall, (*b*) the extent and direction in which the constitution should be amended so as to make the Government of India responsible in a greater degree to the people and what powers should further be develved on the Central Legislature, and (*c*) the demand for full provincial autonomy. Secondly taking immediate definite steps to grapple the most vexing questions of the day by formulating in consultation with the representatives of the people substantial and genuine schemes and stages (*a*) for the Indianisation of the army and equipment for Indians in India, (*b*) for the Indianisation of the Services, (*c*) for grant of complete fiscal autonomy, (*d*) for the abandonment of the present growing military burdens, (*e*) for safeguarding the interests and status of Indians abroad and finally granting a general amnesty to many thousands of political prisoners who are now rotting in jails either for their misguided zeal or as innocent victims of repression and suppression.

Coming on to the question of Council entry Mr. Bhurgri declared that with the present 4 anna franchise constitution and cessation from the organisation of Das-Nehru Party, the Congress was purely of the masses but not for the classes.'I am convinced that the new constitution affords a strong weapon in our hands if only we could wield it by presenting an united front against the common menace of the wave of reactionarism which is now passing through Simla and Whitehall. Further these Councils provide ample opportunities and sure means of fostering Hindu-Muslim Unity by handling all inter-communal and even national legislation and problems with care, consideration, sympathy and frequent consultations between the leaders of various communities for which the Councils afford the best meeting ground. The reformed Councils also afford the best available means for carrying out schemes of mass education and a system of propaganda among and education of the electorate on the burning topics of the day. In regard to communal representation he was not much in favour of it and termed it as an unavoidable evil to be taken recourse to in emergencies and to the minimum extent.

In conclusion Mr. Bhurgri made a fervent appeal for Hindu-Muslim unity and religious toleration.

AN ABRUPT END

The session of the Muslim League came to an abrupt and un-expected

close on 1 April when it was adjourned *sine die*. The circumstances that led to it were that in the previous night (31 March) there was a prolonged meeting of the Subjects Committee to consider the resolution by Dr. Ansari urging the establishment of a national pact on certain lines to ensure unity and harmony among the various communities and sects in India. This resolution was accepted by the Subjects Committee. Mr. Jinnah's resolution recommending entry into Councils and striving for attainment of Dominion Status proved a stumbling block. Dr. Ansari and other leading Non-cooperators vigorously opposed the motion. For five hours together this same resolution was discussed in the Subjects Committee. On Sunday (1 April) at mid-day, when votes were called for and when many members of the Committee had left for lunch Mr. Jinnah's motion was rejected by twelve to nine votes. It was uncertain what would have been the fate of the motion in the open meeting of the League. The parties were evenly balanced. There was considerable excitement and the meeting of the League was postponed from 11 a.m. to 3 p. m. At 3 p. m. again it was decided to hold the meeting at 5 p. m. in the evening. Proceedings accordingly commenced at 5 p.m. and two resolutions were passed. The third resolution pressed by Hon. Mr. Reza Ali was under discussion when Mr. Zahur Ahmed, a non-cooperating Barrister of Allahabad, raised an objection on the ground of quorum pointing out that though the hall was full there was not the requisite number of bonafide members of the League. The President upheld the objection and adjourned the session *sine die*.

Source : The Indian Annual Register, Vol. I, 1923.

62

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS READ BY M. A. JINNAH IN THE FIFTEENTH ADJOURNED SESSION OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Lahore, 24 May 1924

'Since 1920, owing to the most extraordinary and exceptional events which occurred one after the other starting with the passing of the Rowlatt Bill, tragedy of the Punjab and horrors of Amritsar, Treaty of Sevres and the Khilafat agitation, the policy and programme of Non-cooperation enunciated and formulated by Mahatma Gandhi was the order of the day. The League was not able and not willing to keep abreast with the movement started and first approved of at the Calcutta Session of the Indian National Congress and confirmed by the Nagpur Session of December 1920, and had

perforce, in view of a very powerful volume of public opinion that rallied round Mahatma Gandhi's policy and programme, to go into the background. Since the commencement of 1923, it was realised and admitted that the Triple Boycott was a failure, and that the Mass Civil Disobedience could not be undertaken successfully in the near future. Bardoli even was declared by Mahatma Gandhi as not ready for Mass Civil Disobedience; and even prior to his prosecution and conviction, Mahatma Gandhi had to resort to what is known as the Bardoli or Constructive Programme. Long before that the Triple Boycott of Law Courts, Schools and Colleges and Council had failed. The lawyers, barring few exceptions, did not pay much heed to Mahatma Gandhi's call and the students, after a first rush of an impulsive character, realised that it was a mistake. Gaya witnessed a struggle in the Congrest camp and Mr. Das finally laid the foundation of what has subsequently become and is now known as the Swaraj Party, favouring Council entry. Boycott of Council as desired by Mahatma Gandhi was far from being effective or useful. Council seats in the country were filled up, the Khilafat organisation which was carried on could not claim any better position and being the handmaid of the Indian National Congress, it pursued practically the same policy and programme and it succeeded no more or better in giving effect to the programme which it had set up for itself. The Swaraj Party eventually at the Special Session of the Indian National Congress at Delhi in September 1923, prevailed upon and obtained the verdict of the Indian National Congress to permit those who wished to enter the Legislature, to do so. Whatever may have been the resultant good or evil, I think you will agree with me that we must at this moment make use of the good and forget and discard the evil. It is in this spirit that I wish that we should proceed with our future work. Many mistakes have been made, blunders have been committed, great deal of harm has been done, but there has come out of it a great deal of good also. The result of the struggle of the last three years has this to our credit that there is an open movement for the achievement of Swaraj for India. There is a fearless and persistent demand that steps must be taken for the immediate establishment of Dominion Responsible Government in India. The ordinary man in the street has found his political consciousness and realised that self-respect and honour of the country demand that the Government of the country should not be in the hands of any one else except the people of the country. But while that demand is a just one and the sentiment only natural and requires every encouragement, we must not forget that one essential requisite condition to achieve Swaraj is the political unity between the Hindus and the Mahommedans; for the advent of foreign rule and its continuance in India is primarily due to the fact that the people of India, particularly the Hindus and Mahommedans, are not united and do not sufficiently trust each other. The domination by the bureaucracy will continue as long as the Hindus and Mahommedans do not come to a settlement. I am almost inclined to say that

India will get Dominion Responsible Government the day the Hindus and the Mahommedans are united. Swaraj is almost interchangeable term with Hindu-Muslim unity. If we wish to be free people, let us unite, but if we wish to continue slaves of bureaucracy, let us fight among ourselves and gratify petty vanity over petty matters, Englishmen being our arbiters.

'Gentlemen, I quoted in my speech at the Muslim League Session in 1916 from the speech of Mr. Lloyd George which will, I think, bear repetition and if you will permit me, I will quote again. Mr. Lloyd George said : He was convinced now that it was misunderstanding, partly racial, partly religious. It was to the interest of both to have it removed. But there seemed to have been some evil chance that frustrated every effort made for the achievement of better relations. He had tried once but did not succeed. But the fault was not entirely on one side. He had felt the whole time that they were moving in an atmosphere of nervous suspicion and distrust, pervasive and universal of everything and everybody. He was drenched with suspicion of Irishmen by Englishmen and of Englishmen by Irishmen and worse and most fatal of all, by the suspicion of Irishmen. It was quagmire of distrust which clogged the footsteps of progress. That was the real enemy of Ireland. If that could be slain, he believed, it would accomplish an act of reconciliation that would make Ireland greater and Britain greater and would make the United Kingdom and the Empire greater than they ever were before.

This quotation, gentlemen, applied to the situation in Ireland in 1916. They apply to India today if the words were transposed and instead of 'Irishmen' and 'Englishmen' you were to substitute 'Hindus' and 'Mahommedans'. But it applies no longer to Ireland. Ireland has since attained her freedom and we are still continuing our quarrels. It is for you who come here from all parts of India to devise ways and means and find a solution for the greatest enemy of India—the differences between the Hindus and Mahommedans. I have no doubt that if the Hindus and Mahommedans make a whole-hearted and earnest effort, we shall be able to find a solution once more as we did at Lucknow in 1916. It is only then that India, united and strong, will be able to really galvanise the British Parliament and the British Nation into action and force their hands to grant Dominion Responsible Government to India. In the case of Ireland and Egypt, mark how they have extorted their freedom from the hands of the British Parliament and the British Nation.

But while that is the main goal, upon which must be concentrated the best efforts, the energy and the intellect of the country, we must, in the meanwhile, promote, support and advance the commercial, industrial and agricultural progress and welfare in all their varied activities in the country and strive to get a sound system of finance and currency. We must take steps to organise labour in the country, industrial as well as agricultural, including ryots and peasants, to bring about speedy improvement in their economic condition and protect their interests. We must enable them to take their place in their country's struggle for Swaraj. We must teach them to take their proper share

in the constitution of Dominion Responsible Government of India. We must not lose any opportunity to promote and advance mass education so as to make the elementary education universal and thus dispel, the ignorance and darkness and bring light to millions of our countrymen who cannot claim even three R's. We must take steps, if necessary, to see that elementary education is made compulsory. We should, as far as possible, organise and devise means for the purpose of encouraging and establishing Swadeshi industries and manufacture, promoting National Education, removing untouchability and encouraging settlement of disputes by arbitration. There are many other vital and important questions, administrative or otherwise, such as, Railway administration and its management and its finance, defence of India, Indianisation of and raising the National Army, Indianisation of Services, organising and instructing electorates, and supporting candidates for legislatures, local or central, at the elections. All these questions can be dealt with partly by educative propaganda throughout the country and partly through and by means of existing legislatures. While we unflinchingly and with all our might and main support the demand for reforms, provided the rights and interests of the minorities in any existing scheme or in any scheme of advance will be duly protected and safeguarded, yet we cannot associate ourselves with any policy of deliberate and wanton wreckage or destruction. We ought to be prepared if the Government do not make satisfactory response to the national demand for reforms, as a last resort to make the Government by legislature or through legislature impossible and we should, if necessary, about Parliamentary obstruction and constitutional deadlocks. But in the meantime, we must extract all the good we can from the Government by and influence as is permitted to us to exercise within the scope of the Government of India Act, 1919, as it is constituted today.

'The Khilafat question has for the moment, owing to the recent decisions of Angora Assembly under the guidance and leadership of Mustafa Kamal Pasha and Ismet Pasha, taken such a turn that no immediate solution can be suggested. But let us hope that a Congress of the Mussulmans of the world, which is in contemplation, will have, when it meets, in its midst all those most qualified and competent to speak on the question, and the united wisdom of those learned in the law and religion of Islam will find a solution of what at present appears to be one of the most amazingly complicated questions.

'Then there remains the question of Swaraj. This the immediate issue between India and Great Britain of paramount magnitude and importance is the amendment of the constitution of the Government of India. The Assembly passed a resolution last February by the vote of 76 representatives against 48 recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to take immediate steps to establish full Responsible Government in India. The Government only showed its willingness to move by means of a departmental committee to inquire into the defects in the working of the Act of 1919 and further to inquire whether any advance should be made within the rule-making power—but refused to

commit itself with regard to the necessity of amending the Act, except to rectify an administrative imperfection. So we ask for bread and the Government is offering us stone. Surely the position is so manifestly unjust and untenable that it cannot be maintained long. For, is it claimed that the question as to Provincial Autonomy to be granted to the Provinces and introduction of responsibility in the Central Government cannot be even considered until the expiration of ten years' period contemplated by the Act ? It is possible in view of the universal opinion throughout the country to the contrary to work the reforms such as they are without further advance until 1929 ? The statute does not bar an inquiry being undertaken at any time as to whether and to what it is desirable to establish the principle of Responsible Government or to extend the degree of Responsible Government.'

After outlining the present system of Government of India, Mr. M.A. Jinnah then pointed out its defects and how unworkable it had become and proceeded.

'Is it possible, therefore, to allow the present position to continue ? I feel that the situation is far too serious and I hope that the Government has already realised it and will not allow any further delay, which, in my opinion, would be dangerous, but meet the universal demand which is being voiced from a thousand platforms all over the country that immediate steps must be taken to scrap the present constitution and devise a constitution in consultation with the representatives of the people which will give them a real control and responsibility over their affairs and full scope for development of all their resources and enable them to stand as free people under the full-fledged Dominion Responsible Government amongst the ranks of the nations of the world. This is the task before the All-India Muslim League and the country at large. In, therefore, earnestly appeal and pray to my countrymen to unite and organise all the resources of our country for the attainment of our immediate goal—that is, freedom for India.'

Source : Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah edited by Rafique Afzal, 131-36.

63

THE CONSTITUTION AND RULES OF THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE
(AS AMENDED UP TO DATE)

NAME

1. This Association shall be called the 'All India Muslim League'.

OBJECTS OF THE LEAGUE

2. The objects of the All India Muslim League shall be :

(*a*) the attainment of the Swaraj by the people of India by all peaceful and legitimate means;

(*b*) to protect and advance the political, religious and other rights and interests of the Indian Mussulmans;

(*c*) to promote friendship and union between the Mussulmans and other communities of India;

(*d*) to maintain and strengthen brotherly relations between the Mussulmans of India and those of other countries.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE LEAGUE

3. Every candidate for membership of the All India Muslim League must be :

(*a*) A Mussulman and a resident of British India or of any of the feudatory States of India or of any other part of the British Empire provided that in the last case he has not been out of India continuously for five years.

(*b*) not less than twenty-one years of age ;

(*c*) but not a student who is not a graduate.

Provided that a candidate may be exempted from all or any of the above conditions by the Council of the All India Muslim League.

4. Every candidate shall apply and shall be proposed by one and seconded by another member of the League in writing for election, and shall declare in his application that he will adhere to the objects and Rules of the League mentioned herein.

5. Such proposal shall be laid before the Council and the decision of the Council shall be final thereon, provided that the applicant shows sufficient cause as to why he is not a member of a Provincial Muslim League.

6. Every member shall pay an admission fee of Rs. 5 and an annual subscription of Rs. 6.

7. If the subscription of a member be in arrears for over a year, the Honorary Secretary shall give him notice to pay, and if he fails to pay within

a month after such notice he shall be liable to have his name removed from the list of members by a resolution to that effect passed by the Council of the League.

8. The organisation of the All India Muslim League shall consist of :

(*a*) The general body of the members of the League elected under the foregoing sections.

(*b*) The Council of the All India Muslim League as constituted under Section 12.

(*c*) The Provincial Muslim League as constituted and affiliated to the All India Muslim League under Section 27.

(*d*) District Muslim League as constituted under Section 28.

(*e*) The London All India Muslim League.

(*f*) Any Muslim Association affiliated to the All India Muslim League under Section 29.

OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

9. There shall be office-bearers of the All India Muslim League as stated below :

President	...	1
Vice-Presidents from various Provinces	...	20 to 50
Honorary Secretary	...	1
Honorary Joint Secretaries	...	2

10. The office-bearer of the League shall be elected at a meeting of the League and shall hold their offices for a term of three years but shall be eligible for re-election, provided that no person shall hold an office of the League for more than two terms consecutively.

11. No person shall be an office-bearer of the League unless he is a member of the All India Muslim League.

The Council of the All India Muslim League.

12. There shall be a Council of the All India Muslim League constiuted under the following rules :

(*a*) The Council shall consist of not more than 300 members chosen from the general body of the members of the League who shall hold office for a term of three years, and shall be eligible for re-election.

(*b*) The total number of the members of the Council fixed under the preceding rule shall be allotted to the different Provinces as follows :

(*i*)	Province of Delhi	4
(*ii*)	United Provinces of Agra and Oudh	50
(*iii*)	The Punjab	50
(*iv*)	Bombay, including Sindh	28
(*v*)	Madras	18
(*vi*)	North-Western Frontier Province	10

(*vii*)	British Beluchistan	4
(*viii*)	Bengal	60
(*ix*)	Bihar and Orissa	30
(*x*)	Assam	12
(*xi*)	Central India and Ajmer	4
(*xii*)	Central Provinces and Berar	5+3
(*xiii*)	Burma	14
(*xiv*)	Mussulman British subjects residing in Native States or elsewhere outside British India	8

(*c*) The members of the Council, allotted to each Province in Rule (2) shall be elected by the Provincial League of that Province, on or before the first March every three years.

(*d*) The first Council of the All India Muslim League to be constituted in accordance with these Rules, shall be formed within three months of their passing in the manner laid down in Rule (3).

The existing Council of the All India Muslim League will continue to work as such, till the Council is duly formed under these rules.

(*e*) In case the Provincial League or Leagues fail to elect within the time Limited, the Council of the All India Muslim League shall have power to elect members subject to rule (2) hereinbefore mentioned.

13. Every member of the Council shall pay an annual subscription of Rs. 12 in two six monthly equal instalments.

If the subscription of a member be in arrears for over a year, the Honorary Secretary shall give him notice to pay, and if he fails to pay within a month after such notice he shall be liable to have his name removed from the list of members by a resolution to that effect passed by the Council of the League.

14. The office-bearers of the All India Muslim League shall be ex-officio members of the Council of the League.

MEETING OF THE LEAGUE

15. An annual meeting of the All India Muslim League shall, and any other meeting of the League may be held at such suitable time and place as the Council of the League may determine.

16. The Council may convene any other meeting of the League at such suitable time and place as it may determine, provided that not less than 30 members of the League or that not less than 15 members of the Council of the League shall call on the Honorary Secretary of the League to hold such a meeting.

17. The quorum at the annual meetings of the League shall be of 75 members, and at other meetings of 30.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

18. Meetings of the Council shall ordinarily be held once a month.

19. The Honorary Secretary of the League may call other meetings of the council in case he considers the callings of such a meeting necessary.

20. Ten members shall form the quorm at all meetings of the Council and all matters dealt with at such meetings shall be decided by votes; provided that no resolution, passed or rejected at a meeting of the Council, shall be considered to have been duly passed or rejected, as the case may be, unless 10 per cent, of the absent members of the Council have expressed their opinions in writing as regards the said resolution, provided further that the above proviso and the requirement of a quorum shall not apply to adjourned meetings.

21. Written opinion of the members of the council will count as votes at all the meeting of the council.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL

22. The Council shall have the undermentioned powers and discharge the following duties :

(*a*) To elect members for the All India Muslim League to under Section 5.

(*b*) To elect members of the Council under Section 12, Rule (5).

(*c*) To convene meetings of the All-India Muslim League as provided by Sections 15 and 16.

(*d*) To elect a President for the Annual Meeting of the League after consulting the League of the Province in which the meeting is to be held.

(*e*) To collect all information necessary and useful with reference to the objects of the League.

(*f*) To consider and pass resolutions with regard to all matters arising from time to time relating to the objects of the League.

(*g*) To take all necessary steps for giving effect to the resolution passed at a meeting of the All India Muslim League or of the Council of the All India Muslim League.

(*h*) To control and regulate the expenditure of the Funds of the League.

(*i*) To appoint Sub-Committees for carrying out its duties and exercising its powers.

(*j*) To affiliate and disaffiliate Muslim League and Associations under these rules.

(*k*) To frame bye-laws for : (*i*) Regulating the conduct of the meetings of the All India Muslim League and of the Council of the League; (*ii*) regulating the conduct of the Sub-Committees appointed under clause (i); (*iii*) regulating all matters between the All India Muslim League and the other Leagues and Associations affiliated to the All-India Muslim League under these rules; (*iv*) Such other and further matters for which the Council considers the framing of bye-laws necessary.

Provided that no bye-law framed shall be valid if it is inconsistent with

the principles embodied herein.

23. The council may delegate any one or more of its powers to the Honorary Secretary of the All India Muslim League with such limitations and conditions as it may deem fit to impose.

FUNDS OF THE LEAGUE

24. A Fund shall be raised and established called 'The Muslim National Fund' of the amount of five lacs of rupees to be invested in authorised securities under the Indian Trust Act, the interest and not the corpus of which shall be utilized by the Council for the objects of the League.

25. All fees received from delegates, members, Councillors, and office-bearers of the All-India Muslim League and from visitors at the Annual and other Meetings of the League and all donations, subscriptions or other contributions which the league or the Council may from time to time receive and collect, as well as the Fund mentioned in Section 24, shall constitute the Funds of the League.

26. The Funds of the League other than the Fund mentioned in Section 24 shall be deposited in the name of the All-India Muslim League, with the Bank of Bengal; but in any place at which the Bank of Bengal may not have a branch, such Funds may be deposited with any other bank at the discretion of the Council.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

27. A provincial Muslim League shall be formed and constituted in every Province of British India and it may be affiliated to the All India Muslim League on a resolution being passed at a general meeting of the said Provincial Muslim League.

28. In every district within British India, shall be formed and constituted a District Muslim League, which shall be deemed to be affiliated to the All India Muslim League, provided it is affiliated to the League of the Province in which the said District League is formed.

29. The Council of the All-India Muslim League may affiliate any Muslim Association situated either in or out of India, with such limitations and conditions as the Council may deem fit to impose.

30. All Provincial Muslim Leagues, District Muslim Leagues and the London Branch of the All-India Muslim League, which have already been affiliated to the All India Muslim League, shall be deemed to have been so affiliated within the meaning of these rules.

31. The Council of the All-India Muslim League may disaffiliate any Muslim League or Association, affiliated to it under any one of the foregoing sections.

32. All matters dealt with at a meeting of the All-India Muslim League shall be decided by votes; provided that if a division is asked for, the voting will be recorded in accordance with the number allotted to the Provinces in

the constitution of the Council provided by Section 12, Rule (2).

33. All casual vacancies arising in the ranks of the office-bearers or Members of the Council shall be filled up by the Council by election.

34. The Rules of the All-India Muslim League shall not be added to, amended or cancelled, except at the annual meetings, and by a majority of the votes of not less than two-thirds of the members present at the meeting.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE HONORARY SECRETARY

35. The Honorary Secretary shall exercise all the Powers delegated to him by the Council of the All-India Muslim League under Section 23.

36. The Honorary Secretary shall exercise all powers and discharge all duties laid down by and incidental to the enforcing of these rules and generally to his office.

37. The Honorary Secretary shall have the power to appoint, punish, dismiss or grant leave of absence with or without pay to the paid servants of the League but in case of dismissal, it shall be subject to appeal to the Council, provided that all appointments carrying a salary of over Rs. 50 a month shall be subject to the sanction of the Council.

38. The Honorary Secretary in case of emergency and relating to matters not affecting the fundamental principles of the constitution and rules of the All-India Muslim League, may call a meeting of the members of the Council present at the head-quarters, and they will be competent to take such action on behalf of the Council, as they may deem expedient. The resolution passed at such a meeting shall subsequently be laid before an ordinary meeting of the Council for confirmation.

39. The Honorary Joint Secretaries shall assist the Honorary Secretary in his work and perform their duties under his guidance.

40. The delegates of all affiliated bodies shall be entitled to attend, take part and vote at annual meetings of the League as if they were members, on payment of a fee of Rs. 10 each.

At each Annual Meeting a Subjects Committee to revise and adopt the resolutions to be put forward for its consideration, shall be formed so as to include all the members of the Council, and the representatives elected by the members of the League who are not members of the Council and the delegates for each Province jointly provided that the number of such elected representatives for any Province shall not exceed one-half of the maximum number fixed for the Council from that Province.

Source : Indian Annual Register, 1923.

64

LETTERS FROM MOHAMMED ALI TO JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

I

15 January 1924

I have just received your letter, and must 'protest most indignantly' once more against your misplaced modesty ? My dear Jawahar ! it is just because some members of the Working Committee distrust and dislike your presence as Secretary that I like it. Do you think they trust and like my presence as President ? It was at Delhi that I painfully realised what so many of my friends wanted me to do. Their words in acknowledging my leadership are as flattering as they well could be, but they mean only that they should lead me. When I offer them anything in the nature of a lead they fight shy of it. As President I cannot get rid of my responsibilities; and it was nothing short of prevention of cruelty to animals that compelled me to seek refuge from partisan narrowness in you and Kitchlew and Deshpande and some members of the Working Committee. We have certainly not got a very homogeneous Working Committee, and it will not certainly accept anything tamely, but I think it will 'work' and that chiefly through men like you on whose freedom from partisanship I have learnt to rely. Our Orchestra will play very much in the way suggested by the Persian saying.

Man che me sarayam wa Tamburai man che me sarayed.
(What tune am I singing and what tune is my Tambura playing)

But there is no help for it and I know even without your declaring it that you are not in the habit of 'shedding tears for past follies'. So do be cheerful and let us start work. 'Are we down-hearted ?' No.

I am sorry that the AICC Office has not come yet. Do wire to them to pack up and start. I think my holiday, too, is over, and I must start correspondence with all the Provinces and with individual members of our Committee. I haven't got any good shorthand typist yet to work as my personal assistant and in the circumstances you will have to send me one of the Secretariat clerks, the best that you can find. This will give me an opportunity of kicking him out if he is no good, and if we are merely wasting money on him. Do be on the look out for a really efficient stenographer for me.

As regards the applications, let me have a look at a few that you have selected out of the large number that you have received. Our standard must necessarily be high; for, a few good men are better than an army of incompetents. I am trying to persuade Sherwani to take up one of these Under-Secretaryships but of course that will not be the one you need most, viz., the

post of the man who will be in entire charge of the Congress routine. Sherwani is a splendid man to be placed in charge of our Congress membership department, for, apart from worrying thro' correspondence all the provinces to increase their membership, he can visit provincial centres from time to time and see that the provinces are doing this work.

I know you want men not to move too much, and in fact to remain in one place; but there are some departments where the Under-Secretary will have to be something in the nature of an Inspector-General or Commissioner with the Central body who would work up the sluggards among the provinces.

What you say about the insolvency of your Provincial Committee must be true of almost every other province and membership fees, even if they bring very little, must bring us something, and we must press for speedy enrolment of more members. But the Tilak Swarajya Fund must be revived and I mean to begin with U.P. I am writing to the Khilafat Committees in the U.P. for which 'kind' friends have made me the President, and I am asking them to arrange with Congress Committees for invitations being sent to me together with the amount that the Khilafat and Congress Committees are going to give to me as *Nazrana* ! Can you join me on a short tour in the U. P. or must you remain at Allahabad to organise your office ? A good Hindu to keep me company is essential. Who else can you suggest, if you cannot come yourself ? As for the Working Committee meeting, fix one up for any convenient date towards the end of January, for earlier than that will not be possible unless of course Mahatmaji's illness forces us to go to Poona earlier. Why not have the meeting at Poona itself ?

I have received your wire quoting Lajpat Rai's. What does he take us for in asking us to organise a national demand for Mahatma's release ? I think our friend had succeeded in eliminating every bit of the spirit of Non-Cooperation that he had ever imbibed. A government that released him on account of illness will not perhaps keep the Mahatma incarcerated after a much more serious illness, but demands for the release of the Mahatma we must leave to our Malaviyas and Gours, and Lalaji who evidently belongs to the same group had better openly join them. Isn't it funny that those who have been most opposed in spirit to the Mahatma are the loudest in demanding his release from the Government. For us there is only one demand for his release, and that must be addressed to the nation.

II

21 January 1924

I have been scanning the *Leader* every morning for news of your arrest along with Malviyaji's in case nobody wires to me direct about it; but today's *Leader* has ended my suspense for I find the Governor has at last been

'reclaimed' by the Panditji and has not only come to Prayag but has carried you to the Government House to talk ever so sweetly with you over your municipality's resolution to take over charge of the Ganges and the Jamuna and the third invisible sacred stream that runs underneath the two at the Sangam to make the Tribeni. Have I read the situation rightly ? Or are you still determined to go to jail if only for the novel experience of having the Panditji as your 'strange bed-fellow' in this 'misfortune'. If you are not arrested in tomorrow's *Leader* I propose to write to you at some length in reply to three of your letters. But for the present I wish to let you know that I am off to Delhi on the night of the 24th inst. and from there I go on the night of the 25th by the Express to Kalyan and thence on the 27th (by the connecting train) to Poona to see my Bapu. This because when I asked on the 16th if I could come I was told I may but that Bapu does not want anyone of us to desert his post. Subsequently Ansari and Hakimji were also told that they may come with me but that there should be no demonstration of any sort. In order to avoid all fuss we intended to go without telling anyone; but Ansari as a doctor stopped us from proceeding at once for fear of our emotions which could not be repressed may react on Bapu's and exhaust him too much just yet. So we decided to go later and reach Poona on the 27th so that I would not be deserting my post—being required in Bombay on the 29th and 30th and Bapu too would be stronger by then. Now I write to ask you if you would care to join 'the Three Musketeers' anywhere on the way or at Kalyan Station and see Bapu on the 27th. Just wire if you can join us and if so where. But don't tell anyone else—I mean except friends who should not tell others.

Source : **A Bunch of Letters written mostly to Jawaharlal Nehru.**

65

LETTER FROM SHAUKAT ALI, PRESIDENT, CENTRAL KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

14 February 1924

The undersigned is in receipt of the letter of the Deputy Secretary, No. D. 83, dated 5th February 1924, with regard to the issue of passports to enable Khilafat delegations to visit certain Muslim States.

2. With reference to the first part of paragraph 1 of that letter the undersigned regrets that he is unable to appreciate the reason assigned for a

previous consultation with the Governments of the various countries to be visited, and no other reason is 'obvious'. The Central Khilafat Committee has no reason to doubt that the Government concerned would be prepared to receive the delegations unless, of course, any outside influence is brought to bear upon some of them and a prejudice against these delegations is hereby sought to be created.

3. As a matter of fact, however, the Turkish Government has already telegraphed that the Khilafat delegation would be most welcome; and *Al-Qibla*, the official organ of the Hedjaz Government, has also published that the Sharif Saheb of Mecca is equally prepared to welcome such a delegation. Other indications also exist which leave the Central Khilafat Committee in no doubt about the matter.

4. Even if the Central Khilafat Committee had any doubt about the reception of these delegations, it would be far from clear why the Government of India should want to elicit the view of the Governments in question with regard to a matter with which only Mussulmans are concerned. It is a religious obligation imposed on every Muslim to exert himself and make peace whenever some Muslims have fallen out amongst themselves; and the situation in Muslim countries which the Khilafat delegations under reference would seek to improve has recently been aggravated, as newspapers indicated, by a sanguinary conflict in which one of the sons of the Sharif Saheb of Mecca is stated to have been severely wounded by the forces of the Amir of Nejd. It is surprising indeed that it should occur to any non-Muslim that such peaceful efforts as the delegations are intended to make would be welcome to those who share the same religion and are bound to recognise the imperative character of a Muslim's duty to make peace between his brethren.

5. It has repeatedly been declared by the Government of India that it does not desire to interfere in the religious concerns of the Mussulmans. The undersigned has no doubt that the Mussulmans of India would look upon the intervention of Government in this matter as an undesirable interference in a purely religious matter, which is a domestic concern of the Mussulmans themselves, and that they would certainly regard such interference as contrary to the repeated declarations of Government.

6. The latter part of paragraph 1 of the letter under reference appears even more strange, inasmuch as Government is not inclined to tolerate the absence from this country of people whose presence here it obviously tolerates in spite of their conviction and imprisonment for alleged offences against itself.

7. As things stand at present, it is entirely in the hands of Government to prevent any Muslim who wants to do his obvious duty by his co-religionists from going out of this country to do it. The attitude of Government in recent years had forced upon prominent Indian Mussulmans an attitude towards it which has culminated in the case of most of them in conviction and imprisonment for the offences which Government has seen fit to select and specify in

the letter under reference. But these alleged offences concern only the Government of this country, and, even if they are not wholly irrelevant in the dealing of Indian Mussulmans with their brethren outside India, they do not certainly bring any discredit in the estimation of the Muslim world upon those who have been made to suffer imprisonment by the Government of India in consequence of them.

8. Moreover, it is universally understood that the object of issuing passports by a State is to enable those who apply for them to seek the protection of the representatives of that State in the countries to be visited in case of necessity. The Khilafat delegations would not need, and do not desire such protection, and passports have been applied for only because under existing rules no Indian can leave the shores of India without them. To refuse to issue passports in such a case seems to be a clear abuse of a system designed in the interests of those who apply for passports.

9. In conclusion, the undersigned trusts that the passports applied for will be issued without further delay. Several months have alread elapsed, and any further delay would aggravate the situation which the delegation hopes to improve on their arrival in the countries concerned.

10. Kindly communicate your reply to the undersigned as usual to his Bombay address.

Source: Government of India, Home Department, Political, File No. 253/1924 k.w.

66

LETTER FROM MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD TO THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Calcutta, 7 May 1924

Permit me to draw you attention to the following facts :

1. Last year in summer, I applied to the Government of Bengal for the passport to proceed to England and France for treatment which my medical advisers asked me to undergo. The copies of the medical certificates, which were attached with the aforesaid application, are enclosed herewith.

In reply to the aforesaid application I was informed that the Government was not prepared to grant me a passport for the journey. At the same time some of the trusted members of the Government informed me that the Government of Bengal had no objection to grant me a passport, but the Government of India stood in its way.

2. Then I approached some of the members of the Government of India and placed the matter before them, with the result that in August 1923, I was informed that the Government would grant me a passport. But to my great surprise, about after a fortnight when I asked for it, it was refused and this time refusal came from the Government of India. No reason was given why the Government refused the passport and withdrew its consent.

3. Sometimes after that the Central Khilafat Committee of Bombay proposed to send a Khilafat delegation to Turkey and elected me as one of the members. In the case the delegation proceeded to Turkey, I hoped it would be easier for me to proceed to England or France from Turkey. But unfortunately the Government of India in its reply to the letter of the President of the Central Khilafat Committee, regarding the issue of the passport, refused to grant it to such members of delegation who were convicted of political offence involving no moral terpitude. Even in this case I have been deprived unjustly of my natural and legitimate right of movement of going abroad.

4. The summer season has set in and the attack of the disease has started afresh with greater intensity than before. My medical advisers are strongly pressing me to go to Europe at once for treatment. Therefore I beg to request you again to grant me a passport for Europe as early as possible.

5. It is quite evident that my personal case and the case of the proposed Khilafat delegation are different. The purpose of my journey is purely to undergo a treatment in Europe advised by my medical advisers, and the Government may satisfy themselves on the matter as they like. Surely it will not do justice if a patient is refused to avail himself of a treatment and not allowed to make up his lost health, simply because he happens to hold a different view from the Government on political questions.

6. I am constrained to cite here the case of Lala Lajpat Rai. He was convicted for an alleged political offence, he is opposed to the Government like myself in politics, yet the Government in his case could see its way to grant him passport for England. Then why a distinction should be made in my case, specially when the journey is intended purely on questions of health.

7. After the end of May the season will be too far advance for journey. I intend to leave India by the 16th of this month. Therefore I beg to request you to send the reply before the above date, for which I shall be grateful.

8. The capies of correspondence which passed between the Government of Bengal and myself are enclosed herewith.

Source : Home Department, Political, 1924, F. No. 10/XXI.

67

AN OFFICIAL NOTE FOR THE REFUSAL OF A PASSPORT TO MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD

With regard to the activity of Abul Kalam Azad, the secret information in our possession shows that in the latter part of 1922 he was deeply concerned in the organization of a secret society obviously in furtherance of Pan-Islamism, and was in touch with the nationalists in Angora through their agents in Afghanistan. He was at this time reported to have been working in conjunction with Dr. Kitchlew. He was also known at the time to have got into secret touch with Purna Das and other Hindu revolutionary leaders in Bengal. The arrest of Abul Kalam Azad and others including his satellites as a result of volunteering activity early in 1922, however, checked the growth of the secret society for the time being, and no further information with regard to Azad's activity in this connection was received until very lately when it has come to light through a very reliable source that Azad has cast his lot with the Swarajists and been exhorted by the inner circle of the said organisation to bring up the Mahommedan secret societies to the standard of the Hindu revolutionists.

With regard to his motive in going out of India, Azad, in the letter (intercepted), wrote to one of his friends from Bombay on the 3rd June 1924 stated that he stood in need of pecuniary assistance for an Islamic and national service of great importance but which he was unable to disclose in the letter.

Source : Home Department, Political, 1924, F. No. 10/XXI.

68

MEMORANDUM FROM MAULANA SHAUKAT ALI, PRESIDENT, CENTRAL KHILAFAT COMMITTEE

Bombay, 22 May 1924

In continuation of the correspondence regarding granting of passports to the Khilafat deputations, the undersigned has been ordered by the Working Committee of the Central Khilafat Committee to inform you that while strongly resenting the restrictions imposed by the Government in the choice of the

personnel it has decided, owing to the urgency of the work for the present to send only one of the deputations, *i.e.* to Turkey.

The Central Khilafat Committee had already through the undersigned assured the Government that the deputations had no intentions to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries visiting, but as the Government insisted on the petty annoyance of asking the individual members also to give personal undertaking, the Working Committee has requested members of the delegation chosen to give such undertaking if the Government was still of the same opinion and insisted on it.

The undersigned requests you to kindly issue passports for the following gentlemen—

1. Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari of Delhi.
2. Hakim Mohammed Ajmal Khan Saheb of Delhi.
3. Maulvi Mufti Kifayatullah Saheb, President, Jamiat-Ulema-in Hind, Delhi.
4. Mr. Mohammed Marmaduke Picktall, Editor of the Bombay Chronicle, Bombay.
5. Maulana Sulaiman Nadvi of Shibli Academy, Azamgarh.
6. Mr. Tassauduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani of Aligarh.
7. Chaudhri Khaliquzzaman, Chairman, Municipal Board, Lucknow.

To avoid delay every such person was excluded from the delegation who came under the category of those objected to by the Government.

The delegation desires to leave as early as possible and would go via Suez and Egypt to Constantinople, Angora, and other parts of Turkey. The delegation would meet the President and the members of the Grand National Assembly in Angora, the Ulema and other prominent persons in Turkey and to impress on them the desirability both in the interest of Islam and Turkey to reconsider their decision about the Khilafat.

The Mussulmans of India love their Muslim brethren all over the world and especially those of Turkey and Arabia, and they would be the last to do anything to bring discord and trouble to them.

The undersigned will be glad to supply any further information needed by the Government.

A very early grant of passports is requested.

Source: Home Department, Political, F. No. 253/1924 k.w.

69

LETTER FROM MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD TO HAJI ABDULLAH HAROON

Bombay, 3 June 1924

It is hoped that you are quite well. I stand in need of pecuniary assistance for such an Islamic and national service which is the most important and essential in the present times. I deem it unnecessary to give a detail of the work. If you trust me, then help me in it. I mentioned of it to two three other friends in the same manner and they showed their complete readiness. You would at least be aware that I do not like to get help from any one for my own self. Had the work been not of such an importance and necessity, I would not have given you this trouble which is against my nature.

You have rendered assistance in many a virtuous and useful affairs. But perhaps this might be most useful and fruitful help. Two gentlemen have undertaken to pay a greater portion of the required sum and Rs. 5000 more now needed. This amount could also have been arranged, but as the work is to be taken in hand immediately, no other means can soon be adopted to secure the amount. In case you do not like to give this amount for certain reasons, you may advance me the amount for the time I may be able to make some other arrangement, and I shall be responsible to return it, within six or seven months at the most.

I may also inform you that if owing to certain circumstances you cannot afford to help me, I shall have no reasons to complain. If you can help, help me immediately and send the amount by the 19th June at Calcutta. Otherwise inform me at once.

I am proceeding from this place today and shall reach Calcutta by the 7th instant. Reply to be sent at Calcutta address.

Source: Home Dept. Pol. 1924, F. No. 10/XXI.

70

LETTER FROM MOHAMMED ALI TO JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Matheran, 15 June 1924

Do forgive me for not writing to you all this time. You know how much

I needed some holiday after my daughter's death and perhaps you can realize how I have been unable to have it on account of Shaukat's relapse early in April and than the conversations at Juhu and finally this trip of mine to Upper India which took me away on the 20th May from Matheran and brought me back here on the 3rd of June. I have had my holiday 'in samples' and I do not like it cut up that way. Your letters No. 650/30, 750/25, 752/72 and 786 all arrived while I was away at Delhi, Lahore, Aligarh, Rampur (only Rly. Station-British territory), Nainital and Lucknow and No. 824/53 arrived when I was recovering from the fatigue of this journey. Thank God there was nothing that I could suggest to you about the subject-matter of these letters, so that Congress work could not really have suffered. (It never suffers through the indolence of Presidents who are wise enough in their generation to select an industrious 'working' Secretary). Your last letter 862/40 regarding Konda Venkatapayyaji's election award in Maharashtra, although it did not suggest that I would have anything to do with it myself, did not bode anything good, and sure as fate comes now Mr. Mandlik's (?) postcard which succeeds in rousing me at last into spasmodic activity. To give ruling in the A.I.C.C. meetings is bad enough, but to have to give them in advance is worse. I have written to you separately about that and have enclosed copies of the letters I have written to Messrs. Pranjpye and Mandlik. I do hope you agree with me that the last clause of Art. XIX does not refer to the bloc of representatives of any particular province but to the whole A.I.C.C. My ruling is not likely to please Mr. Mandlik and for the sake of 'peace', if nothing else, I would have allowed his lot to come and join us at Ahmedabad. But 'peace' I am not going to have and so I decided to let the 'law' have its course. A province that fails to elect its representatives in time or in a proper manner can have no grievance against the world if it remains unrepresented and if we went on inviting its old representatives it will have little incentive to look sharp and elect the new set. Whatever grievance it has, is surely against the Provincial executive and I have enough worries of my own not to grieve over those of others. All the same, I fear Mr. Mandlik will not spare me.

But the more inevitable worry is that for which the Mahatmaji is responsible. You have been very silent about it and besides Shaukat I have had nobody to share my worry. Now do tell me what you think. I do not know whether my conversations with Bapu at Juhu have had any affect at all in the matter of the Hindu-Muslim tension. Perhaps he would have heard next to nothing about the Muslim side of it if I had not told him what I had *heard* because I do not think many Mussulmans had corresponded with him. Since I could not speak with *personal* knowledge all that my conversations could do was to suggest to him that there is a Muslim side too. In one respect, however, I am positive that I failed to impress him at all and that is the character of his 'worshipful brother' Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. He comes out of it the best of us all. And yet both Shaukat and I were under the impression

that Bapu thought very differently of the noble Pandit. If Bapu believes all that he says about him and there can be little doubt of it – then I must despair of the near future at any rate. I had discussed the matter frankly with your father and he told me that he largely agreed with me that Malaviyaji was out to defeat Gandhism and to become the leader of the *Hindus only* since he could not be the leader of *Muslims as well as Hindus*, and that Hindu-Muslim unity was *not his* ideal. My dear Jawahar, God knows that the Mussulmans too have their Malaviyas and there is no love lost between them and me. But thank God they have not the influence over their community through lack of ability and well-earned reputation for self-sacrifice and communal work that Panditji has over so many people of his community. If Panditji is all that Bapu says he is, then I do not know in what category I can place you and your dear father. Certainly you two and he have struck me as poles asunder. But the Hindu-Muslim tension is not my immediate concern. I realise that it will not be removed quite so soon as I had at first hoped. What worries me most is Bapu's 'thunderbolt' about the Swarajists which I knew was coming and yet hoped it may not come. Your father does acknowledge that men like us have done something to make things easier for the Swarajists, though his appreciation of our labours is somewhat reluctant and halting for he judges them by their results and not by the nature of those labours themselves, as men in his position are naturally apt to do. But we certainly have failed entirely in averting 'the bolt' chiefly because it was in a way 'from the blue'. It was in the very last hour of our many visits to Juhu that he told Shaukat and me what he was going to do and I came and told you about it, though at the time I was hoping against hope that this had only just occurred to Bapu and he would yet change his mind. Even then we had suggested to him that the analogy of the British Cabinet was not correct and that the A.I.C.C. was much more like the House of Commons than the Cabinet. In fact all the analogies are incorrect since the A.I.C.C. is a federal body and though the No-Changers command a majority in the Congress and in the A.I.C.C. they do not command it in all the Provincial Committees and it seems queer to ask majorities in Provinces to resign in favour of minorities.

Am I not right in being under the impression that you too do not see eye to eye with Bapu in this matter? Do tell me *if you can*. But there is a question of 'legality' also apart from the merits of Bapu's suggestion. Is there any law that can compel the Swarajists to withdraw? Can any resolution of the A.I.C.C. make the failure of any member of it to spin or card tantamount to his resignation? It seems to me that whatever view I may take of the merits of Bapu's suggestion, my first duty as President will be to consider its legal bearing. What do you say? And what do you think is the law?

I certainly agree with Bapu that the present 'sham' must end. We have too long tolerated only 'lip respect' for the Constuctive Programme and I do think there are many Congressmen whose respect for it in reality is almost

nil, but who show their disrespect only in private and among friends and I do not see how we can induce the country to take up work under the Constructive Programme unless we ourselves take it up almost religiously. (The *almost* is a concession to *your* chagric at *my religiosity* !) And yet I think there is a flaw somewhere in Bapu's logic. At any rate I seem to see an unholy glee on the faces of some No-Changers who were thirsting for the blood of the Swarajists. And whatever good we did by having Bapu's condemnation of the Swarajists toned down has all disappeared in their ostracism through his latest pronouncement. I do not know if their leanings towards a sort of cooperation with Government have not been assisted by it. Your father has preserved his good temper more than I was inclined to expect; but perhaps that is more for the public and specially for the Government and I fear that your prediction will come true and they will go still farther off from us and go in a very hostile spirit indeed. As I have said in a recent (and reluctant) interview, I am more concerned with the work under the Constructive Programme that our No-Changers do and less with the work that the Swarajists fail to do. I know the atmosphere for work of this nature is terribly spoit by the Swarajists, since the educated classes are too often found watching the Swarajists' doings in the Councils and its reaction on England and the Government there and here, and it is these classes after all that can lead the masses. But is it any good that even those of us who know how bad it is to be watching the doings of those Swarajists should be wasting time on worrying about this state of affairs. At least we should work and not rail at them.

These are my worries at the present moment and my position is not improved by my being a Mussulman and a candid one at that. As the President of the Congress I cannot give a silent vote on big issues nor what I would have otherwise preferred—refuse to vote at all, though on minor issues Presidents often do not vote. And being Mussulman I cannot seek refuge, as you have done at Allahabad in *resignation*, for I fear any such action on my part is bound to react powerfully on the 'Hindu-Muslim Unity'. Even when insulted by men of the type of those who have sent in a motion for my resignation and 'damned by faint praise' or none at all from many others I cannot indulge in the luxury of insisting on my dignity even as a man ! So far I had kept my feelings to myself and it was this reluctance to share the knowledge of them with others that had so long delayed this letter. And now that I have given expression to them in a crude and unthinking sort of way, I am 'almost inclined'—as Jinnah would say—to tear up this letter and consign it to the W.P.B. But I resist—so here goes.

By the way, how do you go to Ahmedabad ? Why not via Delhi with me on the night of the 24th or the morning of the 25th ?

Source : **A bunch of letters written mostly to Jawaharlal Nehru and some written by him, 29-36.**

71

MANIFESTO ISSUED BY MAULANA SHAUKAT ALI, MAHOMED ALI, ABUL KALAM AZAD AND DR. SYED MAHMUD

As the Id is approaching we feel we must appeal to our fellow countrymen in general and to our fellow Muslims in particular to make in the occasion for demonstrating their tolerance and brotherly goodwill towards each other.

We are just returning from Ahmedabad where we had once more to note how pre-occupied Mahatma Gandhi always is with the question of Hindu-Muslim unity. This, even more than the charkha, has been the constant care ever since he came out of prison. At present he is taking very little food having given up breakfast altogether and taking no milk either in the afternoon or evening. His health is far from good and if he goes out on tour, as he shortly inteads to do, we fear he will break down under the strain of work. If to his arduous labours is added the piognant grief that he is bound to feel, if God forbid, anything untoward happened on the occasion of the forthcoming 'Id'.

Hindus and Mussulmans vied with each other in offering to him assurance of their unfailing support at the ever memorable conclusion of the All-India Congress Committee meeting at Ahmedabad and the least that we can do today is to ensure that he receives no fresh shock through our intolerance of ill-will towards each other. We know that unfortunately on both sides men are out to create further dissensions but unless good sense has completely deserted the two communities we trust they will refuse to listen to the evil prompting of such persons.

FEAST OF SACRIFICE

Our Mussulman brothers we must ask to remember that this Id is the Feast of Sacrifice and commemorates on occasion when a devoted father was prepared to sacrifice his son for the sake of pleasing his Maker. We must not mix up our sacrifices on such an occasion with satisfaction of any desire for revenge. It is not the flesh and blood of animals we sacrifice that will reach God but our piety; and it is in this spirit that we must observe the forthcoming Feast of Sacrifice. We look forward to a repetition of what the Mussulmans were doing only a year or two ago when they voluntarily prepared to sacrifice only goats and sheep.

From our Hindu brothers too we expect tolerance and patience. Thus alone shall we prove ourselves fit for the attainment of liberty which is our birth-right.

Source **: The Gujarati, 13 July 1924.**

72

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE ALL INDIA KHILAFAT CONFERENCE AT BELGAUM

23 December 1924

On the night of 23rd December 1924 the Khilafatists met for an informal talk, and, as Dr. Kitchlew's address contained the suggestion of removing the office of the Central Khilafat Committee from Bombay to Delhi, the Ali brothers resented this suggestion and wanted the deletion of it to which Kitchlew would not agree. Harsh words were exchanged and the Ali brothers insinuated that the Punjab Party wanted to take possession of the C.K.C. by trying to have it removed nearer to the Punjab. They also said that it was impossible for them to see eye to eye with Hakim Ajmal Khan and his friends, by which they meant Ansari and Abul Kalam Azad, with whom they had fundamental differences on the N.C.O. programme. Hakim Ajmal Khan and Abul Kalam Azad were Swarajists and Ansari was their puppet. They could not afford to be fighting with them every day by transferring the office to Delhi. They also said that Dr. Kitchlew has forcibly thrown himself into the arms of the bigotted and aggressive Punjab Mussulman party and wished to fight Lajpat Rai and the badmash Punjabi Hindus with the help and influence of the Khilafat organisation, of which he was now the president for a year. They said that they would not allow the C.K.C. to be made a tool of in the hands of the Punjabi Mussulmans and the coterie of Swarajist Mussulman centred at Delhi. Dr. Kitchlew retorted by saying that he knew why Shaukat Ali was afraid of the transfer of the office to Delhi. He wished to be an autocrat at Bombay where he was far away from the scrutinising eye of the Muslim intelligentsia in Northern India. He wished to spend the funds as he pleased and to employ his men, whether fit or unfit, to any post he liked.

The brothers said that they would like him to come and live at Bombay as the president of the year and thus be removed by the baneful influence of their old enemies by which they meant Zafar Ali Khan, Ghazi Abdur Rahman and Daud Ghaznavi. This was greatly resented by Kitchlew and his Punjabi friends.

Another point of difference between the brothers and Dr. Kitchlew was the text of his address. They wanted him to delete all the portions regarding Hindu aggressions towards Muslims in the Punjab and his attacks on Malaviya and Lajpat Rai, but Kitchlew, (was) adamant and said that he would hear no such remarks about his opinions as president. If they did not like his views, he would not preside, but he would not be dictated to by them as to his convictions were based on bitter experience and hard facts. The brothers also said that the Tanziem movement was theirs and now Kitchlew has

usurped it and wished to organise the Mussulmans aggressively under its cover to fight the Hindus. Kitchlew retorted that it was a lie and that the brothers have said so far the tenth time and Tanziem was the only reply to Shuddhi and Sangathan. They do not want to do hard work except shouting and bragging and now when he was organising solid work they were trying to strangle it by saying all sorts of groundless things about it. The conversation broke up in great excitement and unpleasantness and both the parties left the room in sour moods. Early next morning Kitchlew showed that he was not going to preside at the annual session of the All India Khilafat Committee, but Maulana Abul Kalam Azad intervened and spoke to Kitchlew in private for nearly 2 hours, after which Kitchlew took up his address and was seen making corrections in it. The session of the All India Khilafat Conference began at 3 p. m. and all the leaders, including Gandhiji, arrived there but Kitchlew refused to stir from his room. When Shaukat Ali found the situation getting serious, he went to Kitchlew himself and after half an hour succeeded in bringing him to the pandal. The printed address was not distributed. Kitchlew brought only one copy and read the address. Whatever was read, even that much was greatly resented by the Hindus and most of them remarked that they were invited to be insulted and abused. Even men like Motilal Nehru, while on the platform, showed signs of restlessness and discomfort.

In the Subjects Committee of C.K.C. the resolution regarding the transfer of office of the C.K.C. to Delhi was defeated as the brothers worked for it.

Other resolutions regarding condemnation of the Bengal Ordinance and the action of the Government of Great Britain in Egypt authorising C.K.C. to take steps for electing representatives for the world Muslim Conference, confirmation of the working committee's resolution sending deputation to Hedjaz and confidence in its personnel, expression of satisfaction on the expulsion of Sharif and appreciation of action of Ibn Saud and declaration that the sovereignty of the holy places will be determined by the world's Muslim Conference, condemnation of Amir Ali's action in stopping provision and warning foreign power not to interfere with the affairs of Hedjaz, appreciation of Abdul Karim's work, approval of Unity Conference resolutions and expression of sorrow on the inter-communal riots in India with a suggestion that they should be settled by panchayats, support to the Tanzim programme and freedom of Jazirat-ul-Arab from foreign domination were framed by Abul Kalam Azad and passed without discussion.

The support given by C.K.C. to representation on communal basis makes Mr. Jinnah's position on the Muslim League a little weak and gives the brothers a firm place with the Punjab and Bengal Mussulmans. Mr. Jinnah now cannot claim the lead in this matter exclusively to himself, but Kitchlew's remarks about mixed electorate and representation in services on numerical basis is not approved of by any Mussulman except from the Punjab.

Source : **Home Department, Political, 1924 F. No. 167/111.**

INDEX

ISLAMIC BOOK CENTRE

26-PAISA AKHBAR

ANARKALI, LAHORE